A

Peaceable Enquiry

INTO THE

NATURE

OF THE

Present Controversie

Among our

United Brethren

ABOUT

Justification.

PART I.

By *STEPHEN LOBB*,
A Lover of Peace and Truth.

Phil. 2. 3. *Let nothing be done through strife, or vain glory, but in lowliness of mind let each esteem others better than themselves.*

LONDON,
Printed for **John Dunton** at the **Raven** in the **Poultrey**. 1693.

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

THE EPISTLE TO THE READER.

Reader,

BE *not ſurprized, or wonder, that ſome* Controverſie *is riſen among our* United Brethren: *For when ſuch a Subject as this is ſtarted, it is no fault to be* ſtriving, *who ſhall be moſt concerned in it.*

It hath been obſerved of the Chriſtians, *that when they were freed from* Heatheniſh *Perſecution, they fell into pieces among* Themſelves: *And when were there greater ſtirs about the Religion now ours, than at the beginning of the* Reformation?

It hath pleaſed God, at this time, to open a Door to the Diſſenters, *for* Liberty: *And it hath pleaſed the ſame good God alſo, we hope, to give us that Grace, to make a better uſe of it, than they under* Conſtantine; *ſeeing the great advantage, or fruit, which we have made our buſineſs to reap from it, is, an open publiſhed* Concord; *a Concord, which ſome of the wiſeſt, both of Presbyterian and Independent have ſought formerly under divers Conjunctures of Providence, and could not obtain: A benefit, which the ſtrength in* Union, *the beauty in* Truth, *the life in* Love, *the intereſt in* Number, *the comfort in* Fellowſhip *do proclaim: A Bleſſing, which none of us are worthy of, and none can ſufficiently prize, but by a ſuitable endeavour to preſerve it.*

As for the Difference between ſome

of

of us (which I would rather call a Contention only who shall be most Orthodox,) it is no Bone cast among the Brethren (as some would suggest) to break our Union; *for the Rise of the* Controversie *was before the* Union. *It was (we know) upon the Printing over again Dr.* Crisps *Works the* Offence *was* given, *or* taken. *The Dr. being a holy good man, there are several of our Brethren were willing to have them candidly received: When* Gataker, *and others abroad, have branded them for* Antinomianism.

The truth is, that freedom which England *hath had (those Disputes a while lying dead) for some late Years from being exercised in* Polemical *Divinity, hath given occasion to our Divines for their attending of* Practical, *which is much for our Advantage, seeing this* Nation *is,* here-

in, *allowed, above any, to excel: Nevertheleſs, while theſe Controverſies have ſlept, there are ſome, who think, the Enemy hath come, and ſowed* Arminian, Socinian, *and* Antinomian TARES, *and we by diſuſe are hard put to it to diſcern between* them, *and the* Wheat; *and conſequently by miſtake are loading one another with Charge of* Errour.

I do not like (I muſt confeſs) this Cenſorious *Spirit, whereſoever I meet it: But the* Zeal *I find in our* Brethren *generally for the* Reformed Doctrines *according to the* Articles *of the* Church *of* England, *the* Aſſemblies Confeſſion *of* Faith, *and the like, againſt* each *of theſe* Errours *mentioned, (which we look on, really, as dangerous to mens Souls; and therefore are ſo ſhy of them) I do own and approve. And it is the very deſign therefore of my Writing, to*

Vindicate

Vindicate them herein, that howſoever they differ in their Conceptions or Explications of the ſame Doctrines, *there are none of them truly chargeable with ſuch Errour, when they would faſten it one upon the other.*

I begin with Antinomianiſm *in theſe firſt Sheets, becauſe that gave the Occaſion; and the very ſame* Method *which you ſee me take in* that, *and I need not tell it, I intend to take alſo with* Arminianiſm, *and* Socinianiſm.

I feel no delight in filling my Margin with Quotations; but ſuch is the Nature of the Diſcourſe, that the many Authorities uſed for my Readers ſatisfaction, became neceſſary, and muſt be my Apology.

From my Study at *Hampſted, July* 26. —93. S. L.

ERRATA.

PAge 24. line 6. dele *the*; p. 26. l. 4. dele *and*; p. 48. Marg. l. 14. r. *Apol*; p. 90. l. 4. r. *Jurists*; p. 110. l. 1. r. *Notion*; p. 115. l. 30. r. *two*.

A Peaceable Enquiry INTO THE Nature of the Present Controversie among our United Brethren about JUSTIFICATION.

CHAP. I.

The Excellency of Peace *and* Love. Luther's *Opinion of it. The Mischief of Strifes and Contentions in the Church, Instanced in the Rise, and Progress of the* Meletians, *and* Arians; *The Cure Difficult, yet Necessary to be Endeavor'd.*

THE Churches Peace is a Blessing so very Great, and Valuable, that he, who sets but a Right Estimate on its Real Worth, cannot think much to hazard even his own Private Quiet, Particular Interests, and Good Name, (which it is like to cost him) to Obtain, or Defend it.

By Peace, I do not mean only a Freedom from Persecution, which is a Mercy, for which we should not cease Praising God; but the

Peace of Christians between themselves, so oft mentioned in the Holy Scriptures, Commanded, and Encouraged. *Be of one Mind, Live in* Peace, *and the God of* Peace *shall be with you.* 2 Thess. 3. 16. *The Lord of* Peace *himself give you* Peace, *always by all means.*

As Christians are United unto Christ their Head by Faith, so should they be by Love United to one another, Endeavoring to *keep the* Ephes. 4. 3. *Unity of the Spirit in the* Bond *of* Peace. Love, Concord, and Peace are the support of all Societies of what kind soever. The Heathen Philosophers were sensible of it. *Pythagoras* *Jamb. Vit. Pyth. Id. Protrept. c. 19.* esteemed Amity, Love, Friendship to be the most effectual Bond, that Cemented his Followers. And many amongst the most Barbarous have zealously expos'd themselves to great Calamity out of officiousness to their Particular Communion. *Alexander ab Alexandro* gives *Genial. Dier. lib. 7. c. 26.* several Instances hereof. He begins with the *Arvall Fraternity*, who were Joyn'd by such a Bond of Friendship together, that neither Prosperity, nor Adversity, nor any other thing but Death could Dissolve it; and tells us of some others, that were so link'd in Love, that they would not only Mourn with such as were in Adversity, and Rejoyce with those in Prosperity, but Die for One another, and frequently would Die with them that Died, for which reason they were called *COMMORIENTES.*

Peace among Christians, as it is the *Support* of Societies; so, it sets forth the Beauty and Glory of Christian Religion to all Observers, and by Uniting us in our Affections, Prayers, Counsels,

Counsels and Practices too (so far as Agreed) enables us the more successfully to serve our Lord Jesus; Whence it is, that the most Eminent for Learning and Piety, have in all Ages of the Church strenuously Contended for it: Among the Reformed *Luther* himself, tho' a Man of a hot Temper, and much Imbroyl'd, not only by the *Papists*, but the *Zuinglian* and *Calvinistical* Reformers, at last with much Fervour in a Letter to the Helvetian Churches Pleads thus for Peace and Concord. "I have, "(saith he) Perused your Letters with the "Greatest Pleasure and Delight, Rejoycing to "Understand by them, that your Ministers "have, not only most heartily Resolved to "lay by their Jealousies, and Bitter Invectives. "but to do what in them lyeth for Peace, and "Concord. The God and Father of all Peace "and Love, give a Happy Issue to those Pious "Resolutions, according to that Promise, When "a Man's ways please the Lord, he will make "even his Enemies to be at Peace with him.— "We must count upon it, that some on both "sides, will Dislike our Endeavors for Con- "cord, and entertain hard thoughts and suspi- "cions of us: But, if we, who are Cordial and "Sincere in our Desires, do with Constancy, "and Diligence Prosecute this Design, Our "Gracious God and Father will soon give us "his Assistance, and in a little "time the Remaining Heats will "be over——I humbly beseech "you to believe, that I shall "do whatever may be expected "from One, that is serious and "Hearty

Certè quicquid ad promovendam concordiam faciat, id pro virili ita agam, ut ne quid in me possitis desiderare, novit hoc Deus quem testem invoco pro animæ salutem. Epist. Luth Consul. Helvetiæ, Tiguri, &c. A.D. 1537.

" Hearty in this Matter, that in this Cause of " Promoting Concord, I will to the utmost of " my Abilities satisfie your Desires, and Expe- " ctations, The Truth of this God knows; " whom I call for a Record upon my Soul. " For these Dissentions have neither Profited " me, nor any body else, but have been Pre- " judicial to many, so that not the least good " could have been, or can be hoped for from " them.

Thus far *Luther*, who gives me a fair Occasion to Consider the *Mischievous Effects* of *Discord*, and Contentions among Christians, How the Ignorance, Rash Zeal and Peevishness of some; the Selfish Designs, Private Interests, Pride and Malice of others have given the Devil opportunity to turn the Churches into Disorder, and Confusion.

I will instance in the Quarrel between *Peter* of *Alexandria*, and *Miletius*; and touch the Rise and Progress of *Arianism*.

The Contest between these two, tho' differently Reported by those, who liv'd neareſt these Times, was in the esteem of all managed with that Indiscretion and Heat, as brought on them all that Mischief they endured.

That they were both sound in the Faith, and their chief difference about the time to be given for the Tryal of the Repentance of such as under the Persecution Revolted from the Truth cannot be denied. And although *Athanasius*, *Socrates*, and *Nicephorus Callistus* report, that *Meletius* apostatiz'd, and *Epiphanius*, with whom St. *Austin*

Socr. Hist. Eccles. l. 1. c. 6. *Niceph. Callist. Hist. Eccles.* lib. 8. c. 5. *Theodor. Hist.* lib. 1. c. 9. & *Hæret. Fabul.* lib. 4. *de Meletianis.* *Sozom. Hist Eccl.* l. 1. c. 23. *Austi de Hæres.*

St. *Austin* seems to agree, represents the Matter quite otherwise, yet it's past doubt, that the Different Opinions of these Orthodox Guides of the Church, in the one Grounded on a Zeal for Truth, in the other on Compassion to the Souls of the Weak, occasioned a very wide Breach amongst those Christians when they were Groaning under the Violence of a Bloody Persecution. For whilst in Prison the Fire brake out to that Degree, as to issue in an angry Separation, no wonder if it continued after *Peter*'s Martyrdom, and when *Constantine* gave Liberty, was much Encreased.

It's true, *Alexander*, who succeeded *Achillas*, *Peter*'s immediate Successor, did, during *Meletius* his life-time, carry it kindly to the *Meletians*; but after *Meletius* his Death, he violently Persecuted them, who were thereby provoked to send some of their Bishops with a Petition to the Emperor for Liberty, which being Rejected, they apply themselves to *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia*, then great at Court, and a Favorer of *Arius*. *Eusebius* refuseth to help them on any terms, short of their admitting the *Arians* to their Communion; to which, that they might Escape the Cruel Persecution of their Orthodox Brethren, they yielded, and had the Grant of Liberty. By this means the *Arians* gain'd so great an Advantage, and grew so Strong, that in some Years after, they spread themselves so far as to Cover almost all the Christian Churches in the World.

It is amazing to consider from what a small spark the *Arian* Fire, that turned the whole Christian World into a flame, had its rise, 'twas only from the subtil and over curious Discourse of *Alexander*, Bishop of *Alexandria*, the undue Suspicion of *Arius*, and the Indiscreet Heat of Both; for, saith *Socrates*, *Alexander* enjoying much Peace at *Alexandria*, calls together his Priests, and with them did so very nicely and subtilly Discourse of the Unity in the Trinity, that *Arius*, one of the Priests, a Man of great Learning Suspecting him to be a Favorer of *Sabellius*, who held, that the Father, Son and Holy Ghost were but Three Names of one and the same Person, did in opposition to him affirm, the Son to be so Distinct from the Father, as to have a *Beginning*. From whence it follows, that he had his Subsistence from Nothing; that he was a Creature, not Coeternal, nor Consubstantial with the Father. This Controversie was managed with so much Bitterness, that, to use *Socrates* his own words, from a very little Spark a great Fire broke out, disturbing the Peace of all *Egypt*, *Lybia*, the Upper *Thebais*, and many other places.

Hist. Eccles. lib. 1. c. 3.

Καὶ ἀναπτέται ἀπὸ μικρᾶς σπινθῆρος μέγα πῦρ, &c. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. 1. c. 3.

The Flame having thus got head, *Alexander* with the utmost Vehemence Endeavors the suppressing it. He Excommunicates *Arius*, writes to the Bishop of *Constantinople*, complaining of his Pride and Covetousness, prayeth him not to suffer *Arius*, nor any of his Followers to Preach within his Jurisdiction. He calls in the Help of his Colleagues, who Approv'd of what he had done against

against the *Arians*. *Arius* provok'd hereby, doth also write to several Bishops, giving them an account of his Faith in words so very like the Orthodox Confessions, that he is by some Grave and Judicious Bishops esteem'd sound in the Faith. This nettles *Alexander*, who sends forth his Circular Letters throughout the whole Catholick Church, with a Catalogue of the *Arian* Errors, and the Names of those, who adher'd unto them, by which means *Arianism* (saith the Historian) was strangely Propagated all the World over.

Τοι αὔτα τοῖς ἁπανταχοῦ κατὰ πόλιν Αλεξάνδρου γραφόντος, χεῖρον ἐγένετο τὸ κακὸν, &c.

Cum Alexander literas ejusmodi ad Episcopos passim in singulis Civitatibus scripsisset, Latius Propterea *serpebat malum, quòd hi qui erant illis literis certiores facti, consentionis & Discordiæ incendiis inter ipsos conflagrare cæperunt, nam alii literis suffragari, iisdemq; subscribere, alii penitus adversari. Socr. ubi sup.*

Constantine, observing how the Contentions spread from one Part to another of his *Empire*, and how much, Violent Methods contributed hereunto, makes use of more calm ones. He writes a Letter to *Alexander*, and *Arius*, which he sent by *Hosius* Bishop of *Cordovia*, Declaring it to be his Opinion, " That the Controversie " being about what was Incomprehensible to " both Parties, and, in which, if they both un- " derstood one another, 'twould appear, they " agreed in the *main*, did not well to contend " so violently and Break the Churches Peace. " Not that he would oblige them in every " Particular to be of the same Mind: But he " thought they might honourably enough, and " without disturbing the Peace, entertain dif- " ferent Apprehensions about lesser Matters. " A Regard must be had to the different Abi- " lities, Tempers, and Constitutions of Men.

" Thus it was with the *Philosophers*, who, notwithstanding some different Opinions amongst themselves, lived Peaceably together. How much rather should Christians, Men of the same Heavenly Family, tho' they differ in some things, cherish, Love, Peace, and Concord one with another.

So far *Constantine*, who, you see, apprehended the Controversie at first to have been about Matters of Less Importance. But it soon came to be about Greater Points, and the Heats too high to be composed by the Emperor's single Endeavors, or Authority. He therefore calls a Council, which sate at *Nice* in *Bythinia*. This Council drew up a Confession of Faith, to be Subscribed by all; and Excommunicated and Banished *Arius*, for not Subscribing it. They also deposed and drove those Bishops into Exile, who, tho they Subscribed the Confession, Refused to consent to *Arius*'s Condemnation; because, as they Protested, he was not in their Judgment *Guilty* of the Errors charged on Him. However, in a little time *Arius* by some means was Recalled, *Eusebius* of *Nicomedea*, and *Theognis* of *Nice*, making Application to the Emperor, were Restored to their Bishopricks, the Controverse seemingly at an End, and all *Agreed*. But notwithstanding this appearance of Agreement, and the Protestations of Sincerity in their Subscriptions, the Quarrel was only for a while covered, not quenched, it soon brake out again. The *Arians* grew strong, Prevailed, and most barbarously Persecuted, Tormented, and Murthered Multitudes for abiding faithful to the Truth.

From

From these Intimations, it doth appear what a Mother this want of Candour is to Controversie. It is these Prejudices Undue Suspitions, and Evil Surmizings, ensnaring Good Men to fasten an ill sense upon the words, and Practices of one another, and Charging each others Notions with Unseen and Disclaimed Consequences; which does Drive men to Opinions, beyond what they before were inclined to, if not make such Impressions on their Minds as to Provoke them to Embrace those they Detested. Besides, these Contentions being managed with so much Heat and Violence, did at that time fill the Jews with Joy, and exposed the Christians to the Contempt and Scorn of the Heathen. From whence it ariseth, that Peace among Christians is not so Great a Blessing, but Divisions, Strifes, Contentions and Broils are as Pernicious and Hurtful.

Καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς θεάτροις τὴν χριστιανισμὸν γέλασθαι. *Socr. Hist. Eccl.* lib. 1. c. 3.

To Prevent the Breach, or Heal it, when made, to procure Peace, and preserve it when got, is a work attended with unaccountable Difficulties. There are such Remainders of Pride and other Lusts in the Hearts of the best, that Satan no sooner throws before them a Hurtful Temptation, but they catch at it. And it is so Natural for Learned and Pious Men to be Assuming and Dogmatical, that they can neither bear a Reproof, nor a Dissenter; and others so full of Suspition and Jealousie, that Healing Attempts cannot escape the Censure of being Trick and Ill Design. There is such a narrowness in the Minds of most, that they can't see any thing to be True or Good, but what falls within a very small compass.

compaſs. What is not agreeable to their own confined Thoughts and Expreſſions is Unſound and Heretical, and whoever endeavours to convince them of their Miſtake is their Enemy, and ſhall be treated accordingly; whence in all Ages it hath been the Lot of Peace-makers to ſuffer Reproach: Tho' they are ſincerely concerned for the Glory of God, and the Defence of Truth, as well as the Churches Peace; yet becauſe they cannot be within the ſame Circle with them, but are more Charitable and ſpeak favourably of their Adverſaries, they muſt be of the number of ſuch as betray the Truth. He that will deal uprightly with all, and flatter none, muſt count on the being neglected by all. None more in danger of being Scorched by the Flames, than they who moſt heartily labour to quench the Raging Fire. *Nazianzen*, long ago obſerved, That whoever, ſtudious of Peace, do undertake to mediate between Contending Parties, are ſure to be ill treated by both.

Nazian. in *Orat.* 14.

However Peace is ſo Excellent a Thing, that we muſt be content to give the utmoſt, (next Truth,) for its Purchaſe. Gain it we muſt, or the Church, the Souls of Men and Chriſt himſelf will be the Loſers, but Gain it we never can, unleſs we be more Merciful and Compaſſionate in Judging One another. We ſhall never find the Right way to Peace, until we Caſt off Inveterate Prejudices, Unjuſt Suſpicions, Jealouſies, Surmizings, and Put on that Charity which envyeth not, but is kind, ſuffereth long, hopeth all things, endureth all things: We muſt Judge others

others with that Candor we would they ſhould Judge us, and in all Doubtful Caſes take the *moſt Benign Interpretation*, and *Favour the Accuſed Party*.

In dubiis Benignior Interpretatio accipienda ſemper; favendum Reo.

A Regard to theſe Rules in Conjunction with a Juſt Care to Secure and Defend Truth, will Reduce the many Controverſies in Matters of Religion among Proteſtants to a ſmaller Number, without giving Countenance to the leaſt Error.

CHAP. II.

The *Improvement* to be *made of former Diviſions*. *An Enquiry into the Preſent Controverſie, whether about the* Subſtance *of Truth*, or the *Manner* only of *Declaring it*. That *Great Diviſions have been among ſuch as have agreed in the ſame Principles*. *This the preſent Caſe among our Brethren Proved.*

THE Excellency of Peace, the Miſchief of Diviſions, and what hindereth the one, and cheriſheth the other being well conſidered, we may ſee good Reaſon to Advance this Concluſion, *viz.* That a Temperate weighing the Points at this time Controverted, and the Manner of Handling them with an *Impartial* Enquiry after *Truth*, variouſly and in Different ways Delivered is abſolutely Neceſſary.

As

As 'tis our Advantage to come into the World in a time, wherein we have an Opportunity of Understanding How Divisions have Arisen, how Carried on, and Maintain'd, Age after Age; so it's our Duty and Interest to do our Part, that we split not on the same Rocks our Fathers have done. Have too strict Adherences to a Peculiar way of Delivering a Doctrine, Unjust Suspitions and Jealousies, and Inordinate Passions been a great Occasion of the Rise and Progress of Contentions heretofore? Let us then take heed we fall not into the like Evils now. Have many Orthodox Divines, and Christians, such as the *Meletians*, *Audeans*, and the like, lain under the Unjust, as well as Rash Censure of being Hereticks, merely through the Extravagant Heats of some Leading Men? Let us beware lest it be so again.

The Present Controversie being about the Great and Important Doctrines of the Gospel, and managed as it hath been; Not only many Weak, but some Wise and Judicious Christians have been tempted to think our *Differences* to be *Fundamental*; and, that it's not easie to arrive to a Certainty about the Truths most Necessary to Salvation. I will therefore lay by all Prejudices, and in my Search observe the Christian Rules but now mentioned, if possible to Understand, whether the Differences be so Momentous as by some Apprehended? whether they be about the *Substance* of the Doctrines in Controversie, or only about the *Way* and *Manner* of their Declaration?

Its

It's very clear to me, as well as to Men of Great Learning and Judgment, That tho it hath Pleased God very Plainly to Reveal unto us those Doctrines, that are necessary to Salvation; yet such hath been the Industry, and Craft of the Tempter, and such the Darkness and Infirmity of our Minds, that they who Consent unto their *Truth*, have faln into Divers Mistakes about the most Proper, and Exact way of Stating them. Thus it hath been amongst Protestants, touching *Justification* it self, who therefore have been Represented by *Bellarmine* out of *Osiander*, to hold no less than Fourteen, or Twenty Distinct Opinions about it; as if the many Different ways of Declaring the same Doctrine had been as many Different Doctrines. But it hath been some time ago observ'd by a late Reverend and Leading Divine, "That as to the *Way*, and "*Manner* of the Declaration of this Doctrine, "[*viz.* Of Justification] among Protestants "themselves, there Ever was some *Variety*, and "*Difference* in Expressions. Nor will it other-"wise be, whilst the Abilities and Capacities "of Men, whether in the Conceiving of things "of this Nature, or in the Expression of their "Conceptions, are so various, as they are. "And it is acknowledged, That these Diffe-"rences of late have had as much Weight, "laid upon them as the very Substance of the "Doctrine generally agreed in hath had; such "as the humour of some. In another Page, the same Author very judiciously gives this Suffrage, "That tho Protestants have *Differ'd* in "the *Way*, *Manner*, and *Methods* of the Decla-"ration

Dr. O. of Justif. p. 77, 78, 79.

P. 293, 294.

" ration of this Doctrine, and too many Private " Men were Addicted unto Definitions and " Descriptions of their own, under Pretence " of Logical Accuracy in Teaching, which " gave an Appearance of some *Contradiction* " among them, yet they generally agreed in " the *Substance* of the Doctrine. So far this Good Dr. unto which I add, That there hath not been so much Variety among us in the Terms and Expressions used in the Stating our Doctrine, but there is much greater among the Papists themselves about the same Points, and their Greatest Doctors mis-represented by one or another of themselves.

Vasquez is Positive that *Merit* in a strict sense is not held by the most Learned of the Roman Church, but *Arriaga*, in Express Opposition to him will have it, that the most Learned of their Communion, are for the Meritoriousness of Good Works by the Rules of Commutative Justice. *Alfonsus à Castro*, who calls the Doctrine of the Reformed about *Justifying Faith*, a Pestiferous, and most Pestilential Heresie, affirms, that 'twas embraced only by *Claudius Guilliandus*, and One, or Two more in the Council of *Trent*: On the other hand *George Cassander* Proves, that the same Notion Protestants have of Faith, was generally owned by Men of the Greatest Learning in their Church. That 'twas approv'd of by a Provincial Council at *Colon*, as appears by their Publishing the *Enchiridion* of *Christian Religion*, in which this Doctrine is asserted, with the Decrees of that Council, and highly applauded by their most Learned Divines throughout *Italy*, and *France*.

Arriag Disp Theol. in 1. Tho. Tract. de Just. Disp. 1, 31. Sect. 2, &c.

A Cast. advers. Hæres. lib. 7. Verb. Gratia. Hæres. 3. & lib. 12. Verb. Prædistinatio. Hæres. 2. Cassand. Consult. Artic. 14.

Diffe-

Differences about Religious Matters have not been Confin'd to any one Party of Chriſtians, but have ſtretch'd themſelves to the utmoſt Bounds of Chriſtendom, ſo that no one Party can Upbraid the other with their Diviſions. We are ſo much in the Dark, that wherein we are Agreed *de Re*, we can't always Perceive it, ſo that many a time, when a Controverſie, only *de nomine*, ariſes, we Purſue it as vehemently as if it had been *Real*. Men of the ſame Particular Denomination, are ſo Unreaſonably ſuſpitious of one another, as to take it for granted, That every Obſcure or Unpleaſing Phraſe is Heterodox; whereas were we more Exact in our Diſquiſitions, more mindful of Humane Frailty, and more Compaſſionate and Charitable, we ſhould with Greater Temper, and more Juſtice Judge both of Perſons and Things, and find an Agreement much Greater than now we can Imagine it to be.

To come more cloſe to the Controverſie before us, I am very ſenſible, that our Contending Brethren, and ſome others, eſteem the Differences among us, being about the weightieſt Matters indeed of the Goſpel, to be ſuch that the Two Poles may as ſoon meet, as their Doctrines be found in *Subſtance* the ſame. The Noiſe, I confeſs, is, That the moſt Important Doctrines of the Chriſtian Faith, have receiv'd a Wound almoſt, if not altogether Incurable; But I muſt humbly crave leave to whiſper to the Reader, that I think otherwiſe, and do hold my ſelf in Charity oblig'd to believe they mean the *ſame thing* for the *Subſtance* of it. In my cloſeſt Con-

Converſes with each Brother, He who ſeems to be moſt for the Exaltation of *Free Grace*, abhors nothing more than to give the Leaſt Encouragement to an Elect Perſon's Living in Sin, or Expecting an Enjoyment of the Future Glory, tho' he die under the Reigning Power of his Luſts, Unregenerate and finally Impenitent: And the other Brother, who ſo much preſſes the Neceſſity of Faith, Repentance and a Holy Life, deteſts nothing ſo much as in any one Inſtance to Diminiſh the Glory of *Free Grace*, or to add any thing of our own to Chriſt's Righteouſneſs in our Juſtification.

Beſides, They have both Subſcrib'd the *ſame* Propoſitions, which do not only contain in them the *Truths*, about which the Conteſt hath been, but are ſo framed, as to *Provide fully* againſt the Errors, they have been ſuppoſed to Embrace. The Errors about which many have been Apprehenſive are the *Antinomian*, *Arminian*, *Popiſh*, and *Socinian* Errors; all which, with the greateſt Caution Imaginable, are Really Renounced by the Subſcribers. Their Renunciation is ſo full, that there is no Room left them for coming off with that Diſtinction of Subſcribing them as Articles of *Peace*, and not of *Faith*.

The words of the Agreement are theſe, namely, "That in order to the more effe-
"ctual Compoſing of Matters in Controverſie,
"we all of us, having Referr'd our ſelves to
"the *Holy Scriptures*, and the *Doctrinal Articles*
"of *the Church* of *England*, the Weſtminſter,
"and Savoy *Confeſſions*, the *Larger*, and *Shor-*
"*ter*

" *ter* Catechisms, do Subscribe These follow-
" ing *Propositions*, as *what do* most fully Pro-
" vide against the *Arminian*, *Antinomian*, *Socin-*
" *nian* and *Popish* Errors; and shall always be
" Content, that any *Sermons*, or *Books* of ours
" be Interpreted by the said Articles and Con-
" fessions; Desiring all others, if they meet
" with any Expressions that are to *them* of
" Doubtful *Signification*, they would Judge of
" them, and Interpret them by the *Holy Scrip-*
" *tures*, the said *Articles*, and *Confessions*. It is
further Declared, That they Subscribe to all the main Parts of Doctrine contain'd in the fore-mention'd Articles, Confessions and Catechisms, as Judging them Agreeable to the Word of God.

The Import therefore of the Subscription to this Agreement can't be less than to the Doctrines contained in these Propositions as exactly true, according to the Word of God; and so Providing most fully against *Antinomian*, *Arminian*, *Socinian* and *Popish* Errors; and that even as a Rule, by which *Our Sermons* and *Books* are to *be* Judged, and *Interpreted*, which is enough to Evince, that whatever Doctrines may be found in any of our Writings or Sermons Contrary unto, or Dissonant from the main Doctrines contain'd in these Propositions, are really Disown'd, Renounc'd and Exploded.

For this Reason, altho' it cannot be Denied but that many in their Opposition to *Antinomianism*, have faln in with the *Arminian*, &c. and that Divers in running from *Arminianism*, &c. have plung'd themselves into the

Antinomian Gulph, and that they who bend their Strength againſt the one Error, are in danger of being accuſed for Inclining too much towards the other; yet in the Caſe before us, we are bound in Juſtice, according to the Deſire of our Brethren, to Judge and Interpret their Writings by the Subſcribed Propoſitions. Tho' it may be Difficult to *Conciliat* ſome Expreſſions with theſe Articles, yet we muſt not charge them for holding Doctrines Contradictory unto them. The Allowance, that is to be made for the Different Abilities, Educations, and Peculiar ways of Expreſſion, which ſome Men Uſe, will ſufficiently Vindicate our Charity from being too Extenſive in this Matter.

It is undoubtedly our Duty to forbear ſevere Reflections, and hard Charges; to Lament our many weakneſſes, which make it very near an Impoſſibility for us to underſtand one another, and at the ſame time Adore the Wiſdom and Grace of God, that our Worthy Brethren, who have not been able to Agree, about the ſenſe of one anothers Writings, can Joyn in Subſcribing the ſame Doctrines, as Deliver'd by others.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Intelligent, and ſincere Subſcribers, to the above-mentioned Propoſitions, *cannot be* Antinomians. *What* Antinomians *are, Their* Principles *laid down out of* Melchior Adamus, Lucas Oſiander, *and* Luther. Luther's *Diſputations againſt them Abridg'd. The Perniciouſneſs of* Antinomianiſm *Detected. Its Agreement with* Libertiniſm. Hoonbeeck's *Account of* Engliſh Antinomianiſm. *Its Miſchievous Conſequences. Its Inconſiſtency with the Subſcribed* Propoſitions. *What is not* Antinomianiſm, *yet branded with that Odious Name.*

TO make this the more clear, and Evince not only the *Poſſibility*, but *Certainty* of an *Agreement* in all the *Subſtantials* of the Goſpel, I will, with the greateſt Plainels I can, ſhow, what the *Antinomian*, *Socinian*, *Arminian*, and *Popiſh* Errors are, and how inconſiſtent with the Subſcribed Propoſitions.

In the firſt place then to begin with *Antinomianiſm*, which, becauſe commonly Joyn'd with the *Libertine* Notions, I will conſider as Agreeing, and Differing from them, and leſt any who are really tainted with this Poiſonous Error, think me *Partial*, and too much inclin'd to

the *Arminian Party*, &c. I will deliver nothing but what is Reported by such as have been the most Opposers of the *Arminian*, *Socinian*, and *Popish* Notions; such as *Calvin*, *Luther*, and their *Admirers*, about the Doctrine of *Justification*.

See *Sleidan*, *Comm. lib.* 12. p. 312.

In the Year 1538. *Johannes Agricola Islebius*, an Intimate Friend of *Luther*, was the first, that after the beginning of the Reformation, did in *Germany* broach the *Antinomian* Errors, of which *Melchior Adamus*, in the Lives of *Luther* and *Agricola*, give this short Account: "The *Antinomians*, (saith he) held, that *Repentance was not to be Preached from the Law*, "oppugning those, who were for awakening "Mens Consciences by the *Law*, before they "would Publish the Gospel unto them; and "affirm'd, that *How wicked, and Impure soever "the Life of any Man was*; yet, *if he believ'd "the Promises of the Gospel*, he *was Justified*. "He was also for the Restoring *Unction*, saying, "That if it might be, he doubted not but that "the Gift of Healing would accompany it, "for since his Return from *Augusta*, he "had by it Recover'd Four from Death to Life.

Lib. 7. *de Brownistis.*

Hornbeck in his *Summa Controversiarum* is more full, speaking distinctly of them, "as di-"stributed into three Periods of time, to wit, "the *Primitive* in the Fourth Century; the *Be-"ginning* of the *Reformation* in *Germany*; and "since amongst us in *England*. That in *Germany* "*Agricola* was *against the Preaching of the Law* "*in this Gospel Day*; That we were not now "under the *Law*, as a *School-Master to be*

"*frighted*

" *frighted by it's Threatnings*; *But under Grace*;
" That *the Gospel only is to be Preached. We must*
" *believe, that tho' a Man be a Fornicator, an*
" *Adulterer, or the like, yet he is in the Way to*
" *Salvation, if he doth but lay hold on Christ*:
" That we must indeed beware of Sin, and
" work Righteousness; Not in Obedience to
" the Law, but as Exercising our *Christian Li-*
" *berty*, and notwithstanding our Living in Sin,
" must *Apply Christ*, and his Promises, as be-
" longing unto us.

Lucas Osiander in his *Epitome*, saith, " That *Hist. Eccles. Cent. XVI. lib. 11. c. 39.*
" *Johannes Agricola Islebius*, who *A.* 1530. did
" with *Melanchthon*, and *Brentius*, Defend the
" *Augustane* Confession; and after the *Smal Kal-*
" *dican* War with *Julius Pflugg*, and *Michael*
" *Sydonius* Framed that Unhappy Book, in
" which there was a Composition of the Popish,
" and Protestant Religion, as a *mean* for Ac-
" commodation, until a *General Council* should
" be Indicted, and therefore called the *Interim*;
" This *Agricola*, (as *Osiander* expresses it) was
" in the Year 1538. stirr'd up by the *Devil* to
" broach a New Heresie, affirming, *That the*
" *Law of Moses* (to wit, the *Decalogue*) *was*
" *not to be Taught in the Church*; *That the Do-*
" *ctrine of the Law doth not work Repentance in*
" *the Hearts of Men*, but *the Holy Ghost doth it*
" *by the Preaching of the Gospel*, which showeth
" us the Filthiness of Sin, that the Gospel *Pro-*
" *perly* is the Preaching of Repentance. That
" by *Schlasselburgius* many other horrid Errors are
" charged upon the *Antinomians*, viz. That the
" *Law* is not worthy to be called the Word of
" God, If a Whore, a Fornicator, Adulterer,

"or any other such wicked Person, doth only "Believe, they are in the way to Eternal Life. "The Law teacheth not Good Works, nor "is it to be Preached, that we may do them "and many others of a like Nature.

"Against these Errors the Famous Dr. *Lu-*"*ther* did at *Wittiberge* Publish *Six Disputations*, "which are Extant in the first *Tome* of his "*Works*. *Islebius* being by *Luther*'s Endeavors "convinc'd of his *Error*, makes his Recanta-"tion in a Publick Auditory at *Wittiberge*, and "Prints it: However after *Luther*'s Death, he "Returns to his Vomit, reassumes his old Er-"rors, and drew some Learned Men to close "with them. Labouring to get Countenance "to them by wresting some Passages in *Lu-*"*ther*'s Writings; so that, whereas *Luther* had "in his *Commentary*, on the *Galatians*, said, "That the *Penitent Sinner ought not to hear Mo-*"*ses, by the Law, accusing him of Sin*; but "*should rather cast his Eye on Jesus Christ his* "*Saviour*, who *by the Gospel heals the Broken and* "*Contrite heart*; *Islebius*, and his Followers, "would from hence infer, That *the Law was* "*not at all to be Taught*; and thus would they "Palliate their Own Errors by fathering them "on *Luther*. So far *Lucas Osiander*.

Luther, on *Genesis*, doth in several Places
Cap. 19. 21. show what the *Antinomians* are, affirming, "That they throw the Law out of the Church, "and will have it that Repentance is to be "taught by the Gospel; That they Darken "*Paul*'s Doctrine about the Remission of Sin, "and so magnifie *Grace* as utterly to Extinguish "it, and expose Men to the Wrath of God

"by

"by Perſwading them to ſuch a Security con-
"cerning the Divine Diſpleaſure and Judge-
"ment as if there had been no Sin, no fear of
"Death and Hell.

"Theſe *Antinomians* ſeem to be the follow-
"ers of *Muntzer*, who teach, that all Sin is
"wholly taken away, nor are we to Endeavor
"the convincing any of Sin, or terrifie them
"by the *Law*. They, like the *Iſhmaelites*,
"who becauſe the Thigh of their Father
"*Abraham* was Holy, believe Every thing to
"to be Holy. Tho' they carefully endeavor
"to conceal thus much, yet are they not afraid
"to entertain ſuch Monſtrous Opinions. Sin
"being forgiven, there is in them nothing
"Damnable, Sin therefore is nothing or at leaſt
"'tis taken from them.

"This Error they would faſten on the Do-
"ctrines of the Apoſtles. *He that* is born of
"*God ſinneth not.* *I believe the Remiſſion of Sin,* In *Gen.* c. 24.
"by which they underſtand the taking away
"of all Sin.

"The *Papiſts* Preach nothing but Terror, In *Gen* c. 19.
"and theſe falſe Prophets will have nothing
"taught but the Goſpel, and the Promiſes;
"which Error of theirs is much more hurtful
"than that of the *Papiſts*.

In the Firſt *Tome* of *Luther*'s Works, to which *Oſiander* directed me, I have not only met with *Luther*'s Six Diſputations, but with a Paper containing the Particulars of the *Antino-mian* Errors, drawn up by One of themſelves, as was then Generally believed; which for the Reader's greater Satisfaction I will faith-fully Tranſcribe, and add unto it, an Abridg-

ment of *Luther*'s *Disputations* against them.

Unto the *Antinomian* Positions, *Luther* sets this Preface.

Martin Luther to the Pious *Reader*. "There "came to my hands *Certain Positions* (so is the "the Title) of an Unknown Author, scattered "among the Brethren; which, lest I be thought "to approve of them, I would so Publish as to "give the fullest Testimony of my *Abhorring* "them, which God willing I will soon do by "my *Disputations*.

A. D. 1538.

The Positions *of a Certain* Antinomian.

"REpentance is not to be Taught from the "Decalogue or any Law of *Moses*, but "[*Ex Violatione filii per Evangelium*, which I "presume thus to Render] from *the Sufferings* of "*Christ* by the *Gospel*.

2. "For Christ saith, Thus it behoved him "to suffer, and Rise again from the Dead, that "*Repentance*, and Remission of Sins should be "Preached in his Name among all Nations.

3. "And Christ in the Gospel of *John*, saith, "that the Spirit *shall convince* the World of Sin; "*Not the Law*.

4. "The same is Taught in the Last Ser-"mon of Christ, *Go Preach the Gospel to Eve-"ry Creature*.

5. "*Paul* to the *Philippians* saith, Let the "same mind be in you, which is in Christ Je-"sus, that with Fear and Trembling ye may "work out your Salvation, which words do fully

"fully eſtabliſh this Truth, *viz.* That Repen-
"tance, (which he calls *Fear*, and *Trembling*)
"is to be taught from the Mind of Chriſt, not
"from the Law.

6. "From the Diſcourſes of *Paul*, and *Bar-*
"*nabas*, it ſufficiently appears, that, there is
"no need of the *Law*, for any One part of
"Juſtification.

7. "That without which, the Holy Spirit
"is given and Men are juſtified; is not neceſſary
"to be Taught, either for the Beginning, Mid-
"dle, or End of Juſtification.

8. "But the Holy Ghoſt of Old was given,
"and ſtill is, that Men might be Juſtified with-
"out the Law, by the Goſpel of Chriſt
"alone.

9. "Therefore it's not neceſſary to Teach
"the Law of *Moſes*, either for the *Beginning*,
"*Middle*, or *End* of Juſtification.

10. "The *Major* is evident from the Expe-
"rience, which *Paul* and *Barnabas* mention.

11. "And we muſt Judge the *Minor* to be
"true, becauſe the Holy Ghoſt in a viſible
"ſhape fell on the *Gentiles*.

11. *Idem Judicabimus de Minore, nam Spiritus Sanctus excidit viſibili ſpecie ſuper Gentes.*

12. "What ſhall we then ſay of ſome who
"without the Word, yea, Contrary to it, and the
"Example of the Apoſtles, do make the Law
"the *firſt Part*, yea, a *Neceſſary* one to the Do-
"ctrine of Juſtification.

13. "For which reaſon, that we may main-
"tain the *Purity* of Doctrine, we muſt oppoſe
"them, who Teach, That the *Goſpel* muſt not
"be Preached, but to thoſe, who are convin-
"ced by the *Law*.

14. "For

14. "For they, that put on the words of "Christ an *Improper sence*, and say, that first "the *Law*, then the Gospel is to be taught, "and do Pervert the words of Christ, nor is "their Interpretation consistent with the Sim-"plicity of Christ.

15. "As we are to adhere unto the simple "sence of Christ's word, when he saith, [*This* "*is my Body*] so must we abide by the Simpli-"city of those words. [*Go Preach the Gospel,* "*Baptizing*] &c.

16. "The *Law* doth only convince of Sin, "and that without the Holy Spirit, and there-"fore convinceth to *Damnation*.

17. "But there is need of that Doctrine, "which is Efficacious, not only to Condemn, "but also to Save. Thus the *Gospel doth* con-"junctly *Teach Repentance*, and *Pardon of Sin*.

18. "For the Gospel of Christ doth make "known the *Wrath of God*, from Heaven, to-"gether with the Righteousness of God, *Rom.* 1. "for it is the Preaching of Repentance in *Con-"junction* with the Promise, which our Reason "doth not *Naturally*, but by Divine Revelation "Receive.

These are the *Antinomian Positions*, unto which *Luther* in his *Disputations* has a respect.

'*The first Disputation of D.* Martin Luther, '*against the* Antinomians *about* Repen-'tance.

1. '*Repentance*, by the Testimony of all, 'and by what is undoubtedly *True*, is a *Grief* '*for Sin*, *with an adjoyned Purpose of a better* '*Life*. 2. 'This

2. 'This Grief, *Properly*, is not, nor can it 'be any thing else, than a deep sence of the 'Law in the Heart or Conscience.

3. 'For, tho' many hear the Law, yet be-'cause they have not that sense, nor feel the 'force of the Law, they Grieve not, nor 'Repent.

4. 'The *first Part of* Repentance, to wit, '*Grief is Only* from the Law; The other part, 'namely, a *Good Purpose*, cannot be from the 'Law.

5. 'For a man Terrified at the *Sight of Sin*, 'cannot, in his own Strength *Purpose* any good 'thing; for he is neither at *Peace* nor *Safe*:

6. 'But confounded and over-whelm'd by 'the Power of Sin, falls into *Desperation*, and '*Hatred of God*; or, (as the Holy Scriptures 'have it) Descends into Hell.

7. 'To the *Law* therefore the *Promise*, or '*Gospel* is to be *added*, which do quiet and re-'vive the terrified Conscience, and broken 'Heart, that it may *Purpose* what is Good.

8. 'That Repentance, which is *Only* from 'the *Law*, is but the *half*, or *Beginning* of Re-'pentance, or Repentance by a *Synecdoche*, be-'cause there is wanting the good Purpose.

9. 'If it be Persevered in, it becomes the 'Repentance of a *Cain*, a *Saul*, a *Judas*, and of 'all such as Distrust of the Mercy of God, and '*Despair*; that is to say, who Perish.

10. 'These *Sophists* learn't their Definition 'of *Repentance*, viz. That it is a *Sorrow*, and *Pur-'pose*, &c. out of the *Fathers*.

11. 'But they understand not the Terms of 'this their Definition, [*Sorrow, Sin, Purpose*] &c.

19. 'Nor

19. 'Nor need we wonder at this their Ignorance, for they neglecting and slighting the 'Scriptures, can't be thought to know, what is '*Law*, or what *Gospel*.

20. 'Indeed quite bound up in Humane Commands and Injunctions, they only Dream, 'when they Judge of Sacred, and Divine 'Things.

21. 'But the Gospel teaches us in Opposition 'to these Masters of Despair, that Repentance ought not to be a meer Horror and 'Despair.

22. 'But that Penitents must hope and trust, 'and hate Sin out of love to God, which 'is the only Good Temper and Purpose of 'Mind.

23. 'This some, Unmindful of any Proofs 'or Reason, and indeed Heedless of the Matter in Hand, assert to be contrary to the *Law* 'of God:

24. 'And very erroneously teach that the 'Law of God is *totally*, and without any Distinctions or Limitations to be taken out of 'the Church: which is Blasphemous, and Sacrilegious.

25. 'But the Scriptures throughout inform 'us, that Repentance must be begun by the 'Law, which likewise, the Order and Nature 'of the thing it self requires, and common Experience proves.

26. 'They (*viz.* the Scriptures) say, Let all 'them be turned into Hell who forget God: 'and, Set, O Lord, a Law-giver over them, 'that Men may know, *&c.*

27. 'Fill their Faces with Shame, that they 'may seek thy Name, O Lord: and the Sinner 'is caught in the Works of his Hands.

28. 'And this is the Stated Order, that 'Death and Sin are in us before Life and Holi-'neſs.

29. 'Nor are we *now* Righteous and Alive, 'to be delivered over to Sin and Death, but 'actually and in our Preſent State Sinners and 'Dead in *Adam*, to be Juſtified and made alive 'by Chriſt.

30. 'Wherefore we muſt be firſt taught the 'firſt *Adam* (i. e. Sin and Death) who is the 'Figure of him who was to cōme, *i. e.* Chriſt, 'now in the ſecond Place to be Preach'd un-'to us.

31. 'Sin and Death muſt of Neceſſity be 'ſhown us out of the *Law*, and not by the Word 'of Grace, and Comfort.

32. 'And experience clears it: *Adam* firſt 'ſtood convicted a Tranſgreſſor of the Law; 'was *afterwards* Reſtored to Hopes by the Pro-'miſed Seed of the Woman.

33. 'And *David*, was firſt ſtruck dead by 'the Law, telling Him by *Nathan*, [*Thou art 'he*] is afterwards Saved by the Grace of the 'Goſpel, ſaying, [*Thou ſhalt not Die.*]

34. '*Paul* tremb ling under *Law-Stroaks*, firſt 'heard, [*Why Perſecuteſt thou me?*] *then* was 'Enlivened and Quickned by the Goſpel, '*Ariſe*, &c.

35. 'And Chriſt Himſelf ſays, *Mark* 1. *Re-'pent and Believe the Goſpel, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at Hand.*

36. 'Like-

36. 'Likewiſe, it behoved that Repentance 'and Remiſſion of Sins ſhould be Preached in 'his Name.

37. 'Thus the Holy Spirit convinces the 'World firſt of *Sin*, *that* it *may* teach Faith in 'Chriſt, (*i. e.* Forgiveneſs of Sins.)

38. '*Paul* in the Epiſtle to the *Romans* ob-'ſerves this Method, he teaches firſt, that all 'are Sinners, to be Juſtified by Chriſt.

39. '*Luke*, in the *Acts*, informs us of the 'ſame thing, that *Paul* taught both *Jews*, and '*Gentiles*, that no man can be Juſtified but by 'Chriſt.

'*The Second Diſputation of* M. Luther *againſt* '*the* Antinomians.

'*Of the Law.*

1. 'The Law is not only *Not-neceſſary* to 'Juſtification, but alſo manifeſtly Unprofitable 'and altogether Impoſſible.

2. 'And to them who keep the Law with a 'Reſpect to be Juſtified by it, it becomes as 'Poiſon and moſt Pernicious.

3. 'When we diſcourſe of Juſtification, we 'cannot ſay too much of the Weakneſs of the 'Law, and againſt a moſt Dangerous Confidence 'in the Law.

4. 'Neither is the Law given that it may 'Juſtifie, or give Life, or any way to Help unto 'a Righteouſneſs.

5. 'But to *ſhew us Our ſin*, work Wrath, and 'convince the Conſcience of our Guilt.

8. 'In ſhort, Heaven is not more diſtant 'from the Earth, than the Law muſt be ſeparate 'from Juſtification.

9. 'No-

9. 'Nothing is to be taught, ſaid, or 'thought on in the Matter of Juſtification, 'but only the Word of Grace exhibited in 'Chriſt:

10. 'And yet neverthelefs it doth not fol- 'low, that the Law is to be aboliſhed, and not 'to be Preached in the Church.

11. 'But it is the more needful it ſhould be 'taught, by being Uſeleſs, nay, Impoſſible for 'Juſtification.

12. That ſo, Proud Man, confident of his 'Abilities may be inſtructed that he cannot be 'Juſtified by the Law.

13. 'For Sin and Death are therefore to be 'ſhown us; not that they are Neceſſary for 'Life and Innocence.

14. 'But that Man may be ſenſible of his 'Unrighteouſneſs, and loſt State, and ſo be '*humbled*.

15. 'If we ſee not our Sin, we conceit our 'ſelves Innocent: as is viſible in the *Heathen*, 'and *Pelagians*.

16. 'If Death were unknown to us, this 'Life would be the only Life to us, nor ſhould 'we look for a future one.

17. 'But ſince both are taught us only by the '*Law*, it is evident, that the Law is very Ne- 'ceſſary, and Profitable.

18. Whatever ſhews us Sin, Wrath, or 'Death, that belongs to the Law, whether it 'be in the Old, or New Teſtament.

19. 'A Diſcovery of Sin cannot be but by 'the *Law*, and is its proper Effect and Force.

20. 'The Law, Manifeſtation of Sin, and 'Revelation of Wrath are Reciprocal Terms,

as

'as much as Man, and Risible, or Ra-
'tional.

21. 'To take away the Law, and Retain
'the Revelation of Wrath, is as if one should
'Deny *Peter* to be a Man, and yet affirm Him
'to be a *Risible, Rational Creature.*

22. 'After the same sort, do they Reason,
'who take away the Law, and then hold that
'Sin remains to be forgiven.

23. 'Whereas the Holy Spirit in the Scrip-
'tures teach, that *Sin is Dead without the Law;*
'*and where there is no Law, there is no Trans-*
'*gression.*

24. 'So that it is Impossible, that Sin should
'either be, or be known, without the Law
'either *Written*, or *Unwritten.*

25. 'Whence it follows, that seeing on the
'taking away of the Law there Remains no
'Sin, there can be no *Christ*, to Redeem from
'Sin: for Christ Himself saith, they that are
'whole need not a *Physician.*

26. 'And seeing Christ came, not to *destroy*,
'but to *fulfil* the Law, he came in vain, if
'there be no *Law* to be fulfill'd in us.

27. 'And it being the *Law* of God, that Re-
'quires our Obedience towards Him, those
'Νομομάχοι, those *Fighters* against the Law, do
'thereby take away that Obedience, which is
'due to God.

28. 'From whence it is manifest, that Satan
'by these his Instruments doth but *Verbally*
'teach, that there is Sin, Repentance, or a
'Christ.

29. 'But in *good Earnest*, they deny Christ,
'Repentance, Sin, all the Scriptures together
'with God their Author.

30. 'And

30. 'And do more effectually than ever *Epicurus* Himself, settle Men in a most Pestilential Security, Contempt of God, Confidence of Impunity, and in Perpetual Impenitence.

36. 'Take away therefore but the *Law*, and we are free from *Sin*, and need not a Mediator.

39. 'To hold that it is not the Work of the Law to Convince of Sin to Condemnation, is Notorious Madness.

40. 'For this is the *Strength* of *Sin* (as *Paul* affirms) That Sin is the *Sting of Death*, and the *Law*, the Strength of *Sin*.

41. 'Let us therefore Eat and Drink, and, according to the Doctrine of these Men, say, Let him Perish, that careth for the things of to Morrow.

42. 'For, Take away the *Law*, the *Strength* of *Sin*, *Death* and *Hell* will cease to be.

44. 'All therefore that they [*viz.* the *Antinomians*] say of *Sin*, *Repentance*, *Christ*, and *Pardon* are *Abominable Lies*, worthy of none so much, as of the *Devil himself*.

'*The Third Disputation of D.* M. Luther *against the* Antinomians.

'Of *Repentance*.

17. 'The *Lord's Prayer*, Delivered to the Saints by Christ himself—— is full of the Doctrine of the *Law*.

27. 'This very Prayer doth Teach us, That the Law was *before*, under, *&c.* the Gospel, and that Repentance hath its beginning from the *Law*.

28. 'For he that Prayeth for any thing, doth 'first confeſs, that he hath it not, and expects 'that it be given him.

30. 'The Enemies therefore of the Law 'muſt at the ſame time *Vacate* the Law, and 'lay aſide the *Lord's Prayer too.*

'*The Fourth Diſputation of* D. M. Luther '*againſt the* Antinomians.

'*We muſt beware of the* Popiſh Doctrine *of* Pe-'nance, *But be more afraid of the* Antinomians, '*who leave no Repentance in the Church.*

14. 'They are againſt the Preaching of the 'Law in the Church, and really, and in Truth 'cannot be for any *Repentance.*

15. 'That Argument, *viz.* Whatſoever is not 'neceſſary to *Juſtification*, neither in the *Begin-'ning*, the *Middle*, nor *End*, is not to be Prea-'ched, ſignifieth *Nothing.*

16. 'If you ask, what they mean by theſe 'words [*Beginning*, *Middle*, and *End*;] you'll 'find, that they themſelves do know nothing 'of it.

'*The Sixth Diſputation of* D. M. Luther *a-gainſt the* Antinomians, 1540.

1. That Conſequence of St. *Paul*, where 'there is no Law, there no Tranſgreſſion, is 'not only *Theologically*; but *Politically*, and *Na-'turally* Good.

2. 'In like manner, ſo are theſe Conſequen-'ces, where no *Sin*, there no *Puniſhment*, no *Pardon.*

3. 'Where

3. 'Where no Punishment nor Pardon, there 'no *Wrath*, nor *Grace*.

4. 'Where no Wrath nor Grace; there no '*Divine*, nor *Humane Government*.

5. 'Where nor Divine, nor Humane Go'vernment; there nor *God*, nor *Man*.

6. 'Where nor God, nor Man, there nothing 'unless perhaps the *Devil*.

7. 'Whence it is, That the *Antinomians*, the 'Enemies of the Law, are plainly either *Devils* 'or the *Cosen-Germans* unto *Devils*.

8. 'Nor will it help *them*, that they make 'their *Boast* of *God*, of *Christ*, of *Grace*, of '*the Law*, and the like.

9. 'It's no *New*, nor Infrequent thing, for 'the Name of God to be taken in Vain, even 'by the *Devils* themselves.

10. 'The Confession of the *Antinomians* is 'like to that of the Devils, who cried out, '[*Thou art the Son of the Living God*] Luk. 4. 'and 8.

19. 'Wherefore they are to be abandoned, 'and forsaken, as the most Pestilential Guides 'to Licentiousness, and *all manner of Wick*'*edness*.

20. 'For they Serve not our Lord Jesus, but 'their own Belly, seeking Glory, and Praise 'from Men Only.

Thus *Luther*, the *first Reformer*, that most *Gospel Preacher* and Admirer of *Free-Grace*; who in his day excell'd in the Explicating the Doctrine of *Justification* by Christ's Righteousness receiv'd by Faith in Opposition unto that by Works; This *Luther*, observing, how much

some Endeavour'd to wreſt *his words*, that they might, if poſſible, give Reputation to *Antinomianiſm*, doth with the greateſt Zeal Expreſs his Abhorrence of that Error, diſcovering the Poiſon covered with the Glorious Titles of Free, and Goſpel Grace.

The *Antinomian* Cry was againſt the *Law* and *Legal* Preaching, and for *Free Grace*, and *Pure Goſpel*: but their Error, according to *Luther*, Subverts the Goſpel of our Lord Jeſus, even all *Religion*, Natural, as well as what Depends on Poſitive Revelation, ſetting up in its room and ſtead nothing but *Diaboliſm*.

The *Vitals* of *Antinomianiſm* lye in theſe Particulars:

1°. *The Vacating the Law.*

2°. *The Suppreſſing all Preaching of Repentance from the* Law.

3°. *The Confining the Doctrine of* Repentance, *and* Revelation of Wrath *to the Goſpel.*

4°. *The Extending the* Grace *of the* Goſpel *to all manner of Sinners, who can but Confidently Perſwade themſelves,* that *Chriſt is theirs.*

The Miſchievous Tendency and Poiſon of theſe Errors, *Luther* doth thus Detect.

If there be no *Law* (ſaith he) ſeeing the very Nature of Sin lyeth in its being the Tranſgreſſion of a Law, there can be no *Sin*; If there be no *Sin*, there can be no *Wrath* due for Sin, nor no *Guilt*, for that lyeth in an Obligation to *Wrath* for Sin; Nor *Pardon*, for Pardon is the Diſſolving the Obligation to *Wrath*, and where no Obligation, there can be

no

no *Dissolving* it; nor no *Redemption* from Wrath, because no *Wrath* to be Redeemed from.

If there be no *Redemption* there can be no *Redeemer*.

If no *Law*, no *Sin*, then no *Repentance* for *Sin*; if no Christ, then no *Faith* in Christ.

Thus, by laying aside the Law, the Christian Religion is made void, for there is hereby no *Sin*, no *Wrath*, no *Guilt*, no *Pardon*, no *Redemption*, no *Redeemer*, no *Christ*, no *Repentance*, no *Faith*.

Again; If no Law, as no Sin, so no *Duty*, no *Obedience*, for that is to a Law, no Government, for that is by Law, and; If no *Government*, no *Governor*; If no *Rewards*, nor *Punishment*, nor *Heaven*, nor *Hell*; No *Providence* with the *Epicure*, no *God* with the *Athiest*.

Thus by laying aside the Law, not only Christianity, but *all Religion* is made void: for there is hereby, no *Sin*, no *Duty*, no *Reward*, no *Punishment*; no *Heaven*, no *Hell*, no *Providence*, no *God*, no *Religion*; Nothing therefore remains, saith *Luther*, but the *Devil*.

The Reins (you see) are let loose, and Encouragement given to all manner of *Licentiousness*, and Debauchery, which hath not been only in the Notion, but wofully in the *Practice*; which is the True Reason why the *Antinomian* and *Libertine* have been by Godly Judicious Divines put together. *Antinomian* Principles produce *Libertine* Practices. If it had not been too *Notorious* to admit the least doubt, I would never have Pressed it. But the Reproach it brought on the *Reformation*, and the Ruine, Destruction, Havock, and Devastation it made

on the Souls of Men, as it was enough to awaken *Luther*, *Calvin*, and the other first Reformers; so it may well Provoke any Man, fearing God, that hath known what are the Dismal Effects of *Antinomianism*, to caution the Unwary against it, especially considering, how apt well meaning People, are to be taken with the vilest Errors, when cloath'd with the Beautiful and Splendid Names of *Free Grace*, and *Gospel Truths*.

Artic. 13. *De Lege.* *Hieronymus Kromayer*, in his *Theologia Positivo-Polemica*, assures us, that the *Libertines* are very near a kin to the *Antinomians*; and are Exactly Described by the Learned *Calvin*, in a Particular Discourse against them.

The History *Calvin* gives of them is to this Effect; namely, 'that *Coppinus*, a Man born at 'Lisle in *Flanders*; an Illiterate, but bold Fellow, did first Publish the *Libertine* Errors in 'his own City: But *Quintinus*, of *Hainault*, soon 'after excelling him, Gain'd the Reputation 'of being Head of the Sect in *France*, to which 'Country he went, when driven from his 'own for some *Misdemeanors*, (as *Stephen a 'Fabrica* told *Calvin*). *Claudianus Persival*, 'and *Anthony Focquius*, Joyning themselves 'unto *Quintinus*, in a little time they spread 'their Errors throughout a great part of that 'Kingdom.

'Their Error tho' covered with the Taking-'Pretence of *Spirituality* and *Gospel-Liberty*, yet 'was, in its Nature and Tendency very Perni-'cious. Some of their Principles were,

1. 'That

1. 'That *the whole Law is abolished, and no further to be Regarded* by us.

Sublatâ omni Distinctione, totum Legem abolere volunt. Calv. *Instruct. adverss. Libertinos, c. 19.*

2. 'That *every one ought to follow his own Inclination*, and *do what is Right in his own Eyes*; And yet they Confess,

Unumquemq; oportere naturalem Inclinationem sequi. Cal. *ubi sup.* c. 20.

3. 'That we cannot be the Children of God, 'except we be born again, And after a very 'Magnificent and Splendid manner, they extoll 'Regeneration; affirming, *That if we be the 'Sons of God, the Old man must be Crucified in us, 'our Flesh mortified, The World Destroyed, and Sin 'Reign no more in us*: However, when they ex- 'plain themselves, the Poison appears; For, 'they hold,

Vid. Cap. 18.

1. '*That* Regeneration *is the Restoring that 'Innocency, in which* Adam *was before the Fall.*

2. '*That the State of* Innocency *consisted in 'Knowing Nothing*; in *not being able to Discern 'between Black, and White, it being*, Adam's 'Sin *to Eat of the Tree of* Knowledge, *of* Good, 'and Evil.

3. '*That to mortifie the Old* Adam, *is nothing 'but to be Unable to Discern*, or *know what is Evil*; 'That we must be, as little Children, who cannot 'Discern between Good, and Evil; but follow 'their *Senses*, and *Natural* Inclination.

'If therefore any be troubled in Conscience 'for Sin, they thus express themselves. *O Adam, 'Do'st thou yet Discern between Good, and Evil? 'Is not the Old man yet Crucified?*

'If, they find any One to Tremble for Fear 'of God's Judgments, They say, As *yet the Taste 'of the Apple remains*, Beware lest it choak thee.

'If Sin be Grievous to any. They ſay, *That Sin as yet Reigns in them*, and they are held Captive by the Luſts of the Fleſh

4. '*Sin*, the *Fleſh*, the *Old man* are nothing with them, but an *Opinion*, a *Thought*, or *Imagination*: Let 'em forbear to *think* it *is*, and it is not. Whence it is, That in the Laſt Reſult, Regeneration with them is *a laying aſide the Senſe of all things*, and *a living according to their own Inclination, and Luſt*. And they that have no *Senſe* of Sin, taking it to be *Nothing*, are *New Creatures*.

In a word, the *Libertines* do really Defend the *Abſurd* and Blaſphemous Conſequences, with which *Luther* chargeth the *Antinomian* Principles, Differing from them in this, That they are more Free Openly to Avow what the other wants Courage to Divulge, or Senſe to Underſtand.

The *Libertines* ſeem to ſee through the whole of their Notions, How one Part is Link'd unto the other; What's their Connection, and Dependance, and How one Point neceſſarily floweth from the other, and ſo go on to Embrace the laſt, tho' a very *Abſurd Conſequence*, and frame their Practices accordingly.

The *Antinomians*, tho' ſome of them, yet all do not ſo, they neither ſee what naturally follows from their *Principles*, nor are their Practices ſo Groſs as are their Doctrines. And yet the *Agreement* in many things is ſo Exact and Full, that it's Probable enough, they are but the Effort of one and the ſame Contrivance.

The Methods, which *Quintinus*, *Perſivall*, and *Pocquius*, took to Inſinuate their Errors into the

the Minds of others, compared with what ſome Practical *Antinomians* have done, do make thus much very clear.

'Twas the way of both for a while to conceal the Licentious Part of their Opinions, and make a ſtrict Profeſſion of Goſpel Purity. They would carry it ſo fairly as to get into the Converſation of the moſt Eminent Reformers, and other Profeſſors of the Truth. *Pocquius*, who, at *Geneva*, was acquainted with *Calvin*, would fain have got a Teſtimonial from Him, of which, tho' he failed, yet obtained one from the excellent *Martin Bucer*, by which means he gained great Reputation amongſt many Honeſt and Well-meaning Proteſtants.

'Their *Teachers* were ſuch as had been Tay-'lors, and Shoemakers. *Quintinus* Himſelf 'and his Companion were ſuch. [A great Snare to Weak and Talkative Men, who from an Itch after Preaching are Tempted to do their utmoſt for the ſupport of them, who will encourage their Haſty Entrance into the Miniſtry.]

Quintinus ejuſq; Socius ex ſartoribus Doctores fa-ci. Calv. Ub. Sup. cap. 4.

'Their *Sermons* were about high 'and lofty Matters, full of Pecu-'liar and Uncommon Phraſes, 'delivered with ſo much eager-'neſs and fervor, that oft-times 'their Hearers would be tranſported into Ama-'zing Extaſies.

Totus Eorum Sermo de ſpiritu eſt. Ideomata quodam adeo Peregrino Loquuntur ut qui ipſos audiant, primâ facie ſtupefiant.

'They were much for *Allego-'rick Interpretations* of Scripture, 'and New Revelations. They 'pretended to more than ordina-'ry Meaſures of the Spirit, and to

Obſervandum eſt cum iſtos audire cæperis parum abfuturum quin Ecſtaſi aliquando ſupra nubes raptos fuiſſe putes, c. 2.

In Allegorias Scripturam conventret, c. 3.

'ſuch

'such Raptures, as if their Converse had been 'with *Angels*.

By these *Arts* they seduced many Sober Protestants, leading them into a most dissolute way of Living, and to as Pernicious a Security.

Besides *Agricolas Islebius*, who in the Year 1537, *Subscrib'd* the *Articles*, drawn up by *Luther* at *Smalcald*, in which the necessity of the Law to true Repentance is expressly asserted, did *A. D.* 1538. start *Antinomianism* in *Germany*, but, on *Luther*'s Endeavour, publickly recanted, tho' soon after *Luther*'s Death, which was 1546. return'd to his old *Antinomian* Vomit, and in 1548. ran to the other Extream, joyning with some Papists in composing the *Interim*, in which the Doctrine of Justification is fram'd according to the Popish Model; which yet he would have *Bucer* subscribe unto, and was a great Stickler for miraculous Cures by *Anointing* with *Oyl*.

Michael Sidonius was a Rigid Papist, *Pfluge*, neither severe for Popery, nor much against Protestancy. *Osiand. Epit. Hist. Eccles. Cent. XVI. lib. 2. c. 68.*

Thus the Reader may see from what *Manner of Men* these Errors have had their Rise, by what Methods propagated, and how Pernicious their Tendency is to the Souls of Men.

The *Antinomians*, that got into *New-England*, are so fully set forth in their proper Colours by Mr. *Welde*, that I need do no more than Recommend that Account given of it. And go on to consider what Errors have been held by them in this Kingdom.

And because the Learned *Hoornbeeck*, in his *Summa Controversiarum*, doth with much Respect unto them, make his Enquiry after their Principles,

ciples, being a great Enemy to *Arminianism*. I will lay down the *State*, he gives of their Notions, which he Reduceth to these Six Heads.

1. 'That Christ in Suffering for our Sins, 'did not only bear their *Punishment*, and *Guilt*, 'but moreover *had our Sins themselves Imputed* 'to Him.

2. 'That Christ did Redeem all and every 'Man.

3. 'That the Soul is United to Christ, and 'in Covenant with Him, before any good Qua-'lity be wrought in it, and can equally apply 'the Promises of Grace unto it self, whilst un-'regenerate as when a Believer.

4. 'That a Man Believeth after he is justi-'fied, his Faith following his Justification.

5. 'That in order to our being Comforted 'by the Promises of Christ and our making 'them sure, we ought not to Grieve, and Re-'pent of the Sins we have committed from 'sights of the transgressed Law, and of the de-'served Punishment, and so to be humbled in 'Heart.

6. 'That the Moral Law must not be 'Preached to Believers and Regenerate Per-'sons.

This is the Account *Hoornbeek* gives of the English *Antinomian*: who, in the *first Question*, is more Kind to *them*, than Just to the *Truth*, in saying, they hold, *That Christ in Suffering for our Sins, did not only bear the* Punishment, *and* Guilt; *but moreover had our* Sins *themselves* Imputed *to him*: whereas the *Imputation* of Sin, any otherwise than in its *Guilt* is Impossible; and the Author whom he chiefly consulted, is Positive,

Positive, That tho' he had diligently searched the Holy Scriptures, could not in any one Place find, *That Sin* was *laid on Christ by Imputation*, farther affirming, That *Guilt is not only Inseparable from sin*; but *is the sin it self, the Fault, the ἀνομία, simply sin* *.

* In answer to an Objection laid down in these words, *For that Objection about Guilt, that the Lord lays the Guilt and Punishment, but not* Simply, *the* Sin it self: It is replied, *For ought that I can see, it is a Simple Objection* —— I do not think as some do, that *Guilt differs from Sin.*

In this Assertion, there is a Complication of Errors of divers Kinds, even *Popish*, *Socinian* and *Libertine*. Not that I dare charge every one, that holds this Principle with the mischievous Consequences that too easily flow from it: That is nor fair, nor just, for they may not see the Connection, there is between the one and the other; and may Renounce and Disclaim the more offensive Part. However, in the *Oppugning* an Error, and *Defence* of Truth, for the sake of the Unwary, It is necessary, to show in the Point before us, *How* Error of one kind is link'd to that of another; which is thus:

By making *Guilt* to be, not only *Inseparable from the Sin* it self; but to be the same thing with it, the *ἀνομία*, the Fault it self, as it respects the Command, 'twill unavoidably follow.

1. That the *Pardon* of Sin is the same with *Mortification*; and that in *Justification* there is more than an *External*, and *Relative*; there is an *Internal*, and *Physical* Change wrought on the Justified Person, whereby it is, as the *Papist* would have it, confounded with *Sanctification*.

To clear this, we must observe, That *Sin* essentially Relates to a *Law*, it being a Transgression of it. The Law hath its *Preceptive* and *Threatning* Parts. And Sin, Properly, and Formally consider'd, is a Transgression of the Precept,

cept, and whatever is a Transgression of the Precept; or the ἀνομία, 'tis *formally*, and *Properly* Sin.

To Understand yet more fully wherein lyeth the *True Nature* of Sin, it being a Relation, our Enquiry must be after its Subject, Foundation, and Term.

The *Inclinations*, *Propensions*, *Dispositions*, *Acts*, *Habits*, *Thoughts*, *Words*, and *Works* of a Rational Being are the Subject. The Term is the *Preceptive* Part of the Law, under whose Regulation the Inclinations, &c. do fall. The Ratio fundandi, or Foundation, from whence the Relation *Immediately* Results is the *Contrariety*, *Disconformity*, *Deviation*, or *Dissonancy* of our Inclinations, Propensions, Dispositions, Acts, Habits, Thoughts, Words, Or, Works to the Preceptive Part of the Law. When either our Inclinations, Propensions, &c. are contrary unto, or Dissonant from the Precept, which is Pure and Holy, we Sin, are *Unclean*, *Filthy*, and *Impure*. The Contrariety, Dissonancy, or Obliquity is the Uncleanness, the *Filth* and *Impurity*; It is *Sin Properly*, and *Formally*.

To Distinguish therefore between the Filth of Sin, and the Sin it self, and at the same time make Guilt to be the *Sin* it self. the ἀνομία, or Dissonancy to the Command, is too Intollerably Gross, and Absurd, to admit of a fair Construction; It is to Confound the *Precept* with the *Threatning*, to Change the Natures of things, and Pervert the Plainest Truths, it is to call Light Darkness and Darkness Light.

For the *Filth* of Sin is Contrary to the Precept, Intrinsick to the Sin, Inseparable from it,

it

it is an ἀνομία. But *Guilt* is Extrinsick to the Sin, it's only an External respect of it to the Threatning of the Law; It's not ἀνομία, it's not contrary to the Command, but it is God's Will, and Pleasing unto him that he who Commits the Sin, be liable unto Wrath, that is, be *Guilty*; But the *Filth* of Sin, is in no sense Pleasing unto him. Besides, Guilt is *separable* from the Sin.

On this *Distinction*, between the *Sin*, and its *Guilt*, the Reformed do *found* that other between *Justification*, and *Sanctification*, holding, that Justification imports only an Outward and Relative Change, whereby the Soul is freed from *Guilt*, &c. That *Sanctification* Denotes an Inward Physical Change by which the Filth of Sin is taken away, and the Sin it-self mortified. But by making Sin, and Guilt the same, Pardon of Sin, also, and its Mortification must be the same too; and that in Justification an Inward and Physical Change is wrought on the Soul. In a word, in that Great Controversie, the most Important One, agitated between *Us* and the *Papist*, even touching the Glorious Doctrine of Justification, the Cause is in *Fact* given up by the *Antinomian* unto the *Papist*. Thus in running from Popery, they continue their flight so long till they return to that very Point from whence they did at first set out, and Unwarily give Life to the Error they seem mostly to abhor.

Again, if Guilt be *Inseparable* from the Sin, there can be no taking away the Guilt by Pardon, but the Sin it self, the Fault ceaseth to be, and consequently, if the Sin of our Nature, with

with those Inclinations and Lustings after Evil be Pardoned, they cease to be sinful, a Notion that will exceedingly Please the Roman Catholicks, who deny *Concupiscence* to be *Sin*, in those that Believe.

2. The *Imputation of Sin* is made *Impossible*, either from *Adam* unto Us; or *from us* unto *Christ*. A Notion no way ungrateful unto the *Arminian* Party, who hold, 'That *Adam*'s Sin 'was in no other sense *Imputed* 'unto his Posterity, then as they 'are by Birth made subject to 'the same Calamities with *A-* 'dam. An *Imputation* of the *Guilt* 'of Sin they deny, as contrary 'to the Holy *Scriptures*, the *Di-* 'vine Truth, *Wisdom*, and *Good-* 'ness, the *Nature of Sin*, as well 'as the Formal Reason of Righte- 'ousness. Although we are born 'without an *Original Righteousness*, 'yet there is not (say they) either 'the *malum Culpæ*; nor the *malum* 'pœna, the Evil of the *Fault*, nor 'of the *Punishment*, on any of 'Adam's Offspring by Birth: Not 'the *Evil* of the *Fault*, because 'not *Voluntary*; and if not the 'Evil of the Fault, it cannot be 'the Evil of Punishment; the 'Fault, and *Punishment* being *Re-* 'lata, and Inseparable. That 'those Acts, which follow the 'Privation of Original Righte- 'ousness, are not *formally Sins*, or, 'what

Fatentur (*vid. Remonstrantes*) *Peccatum* Adami Imputatum *Dici Posse Posteris ejus, quatenus Deus Posteros* Adamo *Eidem malo cui* Adamus *per Peccatum obnoxium se reddidit, obnoxios nasci voluit, sive quatenus Deus malum, quod in Pœnam* Adamo *Inflictum fuerat, in Posteros Ejus dimanare & transire permisit. At nihil egit* Eos *dicere, Peccatum* Adami *Posteris ejus sic fuisse à Deo* Imputatum, *quasi Deus Posteros Adami reverà consulsset Ejusdem cum Adamo peccati & culpæ quam Adamus commisrat REOS. Imo nec scriptura, nec Veritas, nec Sapientia, nec Bonitas Divina, nec Peccati Natura,* &c. *permittunt ut sic* Imputatum *peccatum*, Adami. *& e Malum Culpæ non est, quia nasci plane Involuntarium est. ergo & nasci cum hâc vel Illâ labe,* &c. *Si* malum Culpæ *non est, nec malum Pœnæ, quia* Culpa & Pœna sunt Relata. *Rem. Apol. ad Cens.* c. 7. § 4.

'what is the ſame, are not ſuch 'acts, *as oblige to Puniſhment*. That 'they are *materially* Sins, that is, 'Diſconform to the Divine Will, 'they do not Deny, but *formally*, 'they are not Sins, for they *Ob-* 'lige not to Puniſhment. Whereby it is evident, they make *Guilt*, which is the Obligation to Puniſhment, to be Formally the Sin, and therefore Inſeparable from it. What Differences ſoever there may be between the *Antinomian*, and *Arminian* in the Method taken to advance the Notion, of Guilt's being Inſeparable from Sin, yet they agree in the Aſſertion, that *Guilt*, *and* Sin *are Inſeparable*.

Nam Remonſtr. negant actus illos, qui ſequuntur Deſtitutionem, ſive Privationem illam divinam, eſſe Formaliter Peccata, *i. e. illos valide* Obligare ad Pœnam. *Eos, qui, actus iſtos patrant. Non negant quidem actus illos* Materialiter *Peccata dici poſſe; quatenus actus ſunt Diſformis voluntati Divinæ, at negant eos* formaliter *eſſe Peccata, quæ ſc. ad Pœnam obligent eos, à quibus fiunt Sitpol. Ubi ſup.*

Dr. O. *Of Juſtificat.* p. 284, 285.

But Dr. *Owen* gives a truer Account of this Matter, when he tells us, 'That there is in Sin 'a *Tranſgreſſion of the Preceptive* part of the 'Law, and there is an Obnoxiouſneſs unto the 'Puniſhment from the Sanction of it.—— Sin 'under this Conſideration, as a *Tranſgreſſion of 'the Preceptive Part of the Law*, cannot be com- 'municated from One unto another, unleſs it 'be by the Propagation of a vitiated Principle, 'or Habit. But yet neither ſo will the *Perſonal 'Sin* of one, as Inherent in him, ever come to 'be the Perſonal Sin of Another. To which I add, That as the *Sin it ſelf* cannot Paſs from one to Another; in like manner, if the Guilt *cannot be ſeparated* from the Sin, then the Guilt of *Adam's Sin* could not paſs from Him to us. It could in no ſenſe be made Ours; Not the *Sin* it ſelf, for that is Impoſſible; nor the Sin in its

its *Guilt*, because, as they affirm, it's *Inseparable* from the Sin it self.

Socinus, *Smalcius* and *Ostorodius*, in *Peltius* his *Harmony*, deliver themselves to the same Purpose, giving us Light enough about the True Reason, why they Deny *Original Sin*; For, (say they) 'the Doctrine of Original Sin is 'a Jewish Fable, brought into the 'Church by Antichrist, to establish (as *Socinus* blasphemously expresses it) these *Pernicious* 'Dogmata, viz. The Incarnation 'of God, & Infant Baptism. And 'in *Peltius* they Declare, That if 'the Question be; Whether, seeing our Descent is from *Adam*, we are by Birth obnoxious 'to any *Punishment*, or *Fault* for *Adam's* Sin? 'The Answer is, That to the being *Faulty*, it's 'necessary there be some voluntary Act done 'by him, who is *Faulty*; And *Punishment* there 'cannot be, where there is no such Anteceding 'Fault, we are not therefore born, either Faulty or Obnoxious to Punishment.

Commentum illud de Peccato Originis, (ex Parentum Culpæ, fabula est Judaica, & ab Anti-Christo in Ecclesiam Introductum, ad stabiliendum Pernicioſa Dogmata, *nempe* Dei Incarnationem, Infantium Baptismum. *Socin. Dial. Justif. t. 11.*

Pelti Har. Remonst. & Socin. Artic. 8. Parag. 4. f. 69.

This *Agreement* between the *Antinomian*, *Arminian*, and *Socinian* about the *Inseparableness* of the *Sin it self*, and *Guilt*, is not only Inconsistent with the Doctrine of *Original Sin*, but strikes at the very Root of Christ's Satisfaction. A Physical Translation or Transfusion of Sin from One to another, being Naturally and Spiritually Impossible, there can be no Imputing the Guilt, nor Inflicting the Punishment of our Sins on Christ. The Links of the Chain lye thus; If Christ did not endure the Punishment, and suf-

fer for our Sins, he could not make Satisfaction for them; If the *Guilt* of Sin was not Imputed, the Punishment could not be Justly inflicted; If the *Guilt* be *Inseparable* from the Sin it self, and *that* Impossible to Pass from us to Christ (as really it is) the Guilt cannot be Imputed. Thus if no Guilt be Imputed, no Punishment can be by a Righteous God Inflicted; if no Punishment Inflicted, nor Suffering for our Sins, no Satisfaction can be made. And if Salvation may be without Satisfaction, what need of the Incarnation of the Son of God?

This Assertion then, that the Sin it self, and Guilt are Inseparable, doth not only give Advantage to the *Papist* by confounding Justification with Sanctification; but to the *Arminian*, in making it Impossible for the Guilt of *Adam*'s Sin to be Imputed unto his Posterity; and to the *Socinian* by subverting Christ's Satisfaction, necessarily driving Men, either into the Horror of *Despair*, or into *Libertine* Practices.

The Guilt of Sin is an Exernal Respect of it, with regard to the Sanction of the Law *only*. This is *SEPARABLE* from Sin, if *IT WERE NOT SO*, no *One Sinner could either be Pardoned*, or *Saved*. Dr. *O.* of Justif. *ub. sup.*

If Guilt be Inseparable from the Sin it self, so long as Sin Remains in us, a *Pardon*, which lyeth in the Removing Guilt, cannot possibly be obtain'd, which Fills *many* with *Despair*.

But if on the other hand, we suppose, the Pardon of Sin Possible, notwithstanding Guilt is made Inseparable from the Sin, it must then be Granted, that when ever the Guilt is Removed, and the Sin Pardoned, the Sin it self is Destroyed, It's formal Nature is taken away, and what Lewdness soever they Commit, there is

no

no Sin in them. All Sin, Past, Present, and to Come, being (as they hold) forgiven them, there is no Sin in their *Drunkenness*, *Murder*, or *Adultery*. They may do what they list, they may Rob, Plunder, Oppress the Fatherless and Widow, commit Sodomy and all the Outrages Imaginable; but according to this Principle, Sin they cannot, than which what Greater Encouragement can there be given to *Libertinism*?

By this little, we may see, what Poison is within the Compass of this first *Antinomian* Error, to wit, Their making the Sin it self, the *ἀνομία*, the Obliquity or the Fault; and *Guilt* to be *Inseparable*, if not the same thing. And affirming, that not only the Punishment and Guilt of Sin, but moreover the Sin it self, was laid on Christ; the worst of *Popery*, *Arminianism*, *Socinianism*, and the *Libertine* Abominations flow from it; And, the other Parts of their *Scheme* are of the same kind, as I will endeavor Particularly to Evince.

The *Second* is for *Universal Redemption*; which they are Unawares led into, by their holding Justification to be before Faith, and their making the Preaching the Gospel necessary for the Relief of Distressed Consciences. If Justification be before Faith; then, nor Unbelief, nor any other obstinate Reigning Sin, can be a Bar unto it. The Absence of what follows Justification cannot hinder your being Justified; for your being Justified before *it*, necessarily infers your Justification in the Absence thereof, which therefore can be no *Impediment*, or *Hindrance* unto it. And if, in the Absence of Faith,

Juſtification is not ſuſpended, But notwithſtanding the Reigning Power of Unbelief and other Luſts the Sinner is Juſtified, what need of Preaching the Goſpel; Or, of what Uſe can Goſpel-Promiſes be to any? Whether the Elect be *troubled* for Sin, or *not*, they are by theſe Men placed in a very ſafe State, as free from *Wrath*, as the *Saint* in Glory; But if any ſuch be *troubled*, what is there in the Promiſe for their Comfort? or, what Right, what Title, what Intereſt hath any Man of a Troubled or Diſtreſſed Conſcience, in a Promiſe? He knows not to whom the Promiſe doth belong, and therefore can't ſay, he hath any Title to it. If it be ſaid, It belongs to the *Elect*, as *ſuch*, this can't help him, nor remove the Cauſe of his Sorrow. He Believes it ſhall be well with the Elect, but knows not that he is Elected. He is rather afraid he is not, what then muſt he do for Comfort? Muſt he look into his own heart, and try himſelf by marks and ſigns? Muſt he Enquire, whether he hath been convinced of Sin, humbled in the ſence of the Evils thereof, ſenſible of his Loſt Eſtate out of Chriſt, and of a Neceſſity of cloſing with him on his own Terms? No, This is too much, for it's, *Legale*, and diſpoſes Men to make a Chriſt of their own Righteouſneſs. Muſt they Repent, and Believe, that they may be Pardoned? There are many Elect Perſons who can't ſee they have Repented, or Believed. They have no Faith they are ſure, and how ſhall they be Comforted? For the Comfort of theſe, the *Antinomian* Declares, The want of Faith can be no Bar to their Juſtification, or Pardon, that

that the Promiſe is made to *Sinners*, as *ſuch*, as they are *Sinners*, and that no one Sin, or many Sins, how Obſtinate ſoever, can hinder their Intereſt in the Promiſe. Are they Sinners? that can't be denied; It's then, (they ſay) ſufficient. Let them come to Chriſt, Let them Come, tho' under the Reigning Power of Blaſphemy, and Unbelief; Let them come to Chriſt, and be Comforted; Let them be but perſwaded that their Sins are Pardoned, and it is ſo; for the *Promiſe* is to *Sinners* as *Sinners*, and therefore to all and every Sinner.

This is the Duty (they ſay) of every Man to look on the Promiſe, as made unto them, that is, All muſt believe, that their Sins are Pardoned, becauſe the Promiſe is unto all, which cannot be, Unleſs *All* be *Redeemed*. The Pardon of Sin is not given to any but ſuch as are Redeemed. If all muſt believe, that their Sins are Pardoned, becauſe the Promiſe of Pardon is to all Sinners, as ſuch, then all are Pardoned, then all are Redeemed.

Thus you have the Reaſon, why *Hoornbeek* charges the Engliſh *Antinomian*, with holding *Univerſal Redemption*; to which their Third *Principle* is Conform.

3. *That the Soul is United to Chriſt, and in Covenant with him before any Good Quality be wrought in the Heart*, and *that it can Apply the Promiſe of Grace, as well whilſt Unregenerate, as when a Believer.*

The *Promiſe*, being made to the Sinner, *as he is a Sinner*, and therefore to every Sinner, he may, whilſt he is a Sinner, apply the Promiſe, as well as when a Believer, or indeed *rather bet-*

ter, because the Promise belongs not to him, as he is a *Believer*; but, as he is a *Sinner*, and yet the Promise belonging to him as he is a Sinner, he must be in Covenant, for the Extent of the Promise is not, nor can be any larger than *that* of the Covenant, and being in Covenant, partaking of Saving Benefits, they must be *United* unto Christ whilst Sinners. None so in Covenant with God, as to be actually Interested in the special Blessings of it, but such as are United unto Christ, which according to this *Antinomian* Principle, Men may be many Years before they aright believe, or are Regenerated: For, (as in their *Fourth Assertion*)

4. *Their Justification is before their Faith*, and their Faith followeth their Justification.

Thus much must be asserted, or all that had been formerly said, would have signified nothing, as is obvious to a Common Capacity, and that which is as necessary a Link in this Chain, as the other is; The *Fifth*, viz.

5. *That in order to our being Comforted by the Promises of Christ, and making them sure, and certain to us*; To Grieve and Repent of the Sins we have Committed, from Sights of the transgressed Law; and the Deserved Punishment, is not *necessary*.

The Reason is manifest. The Promise being made to *Sinners*, as *Sinners*, their Comforts, and Assurances must arise from the Consideration of their being *Sinners*; and not from their Grief for Sin, their Repentance, or Humiliations. To them as Penitent, and Humbled, the Promise is not, but as Impenitent, Unbumbled, and Unbelievers; and the Promise being

being unto them, *as such*, their Comforts, and Assurances must arise from them.

But of what use then is the *Law?* It is of none, especially unto Believers, or Regenerate Persons, as is held by them in their Sixth *Assertion.*

6. The Moral Law must not be Preached to Believers, and Regenerate Persons.

It might have been added by them, that the Preaching of the Law is of no use at all unto *any*; For Sin, and Guilt being made by them Inseparable from One another, the Guilt being, in Pardon, Removed, whil'st Unregenerate, and under the Power of Unbelief, there is no Sin left in them; No formal Sins to Repent of, which makes the Preaching of the Law to be altogether Useless unto *Unbelievers.*

Thus, "*Sin*, and *Guilt*, being made Inseparable, not only the *Guilt*, but the *Sin it self*, 'was laid on Christ and taken from the Elect, 'and the Promise being to *Sinners*, as *Sinners*; 'all Sinners are Redeemed, actually Redeemed 'from the Wrath to Come, United unto Christ, 'and in Covenant with him, their Sins Pardoned 'and they Justified, and may apply the Promi-'ses to themselves, whil'st under the Reigning 'Power of Sin, as well as when Believers; 'and therefore Sorrow for Sin and Repentance 'arising from sights of the Law, and of Deser-'ved Punishment is not Necessary to their Com-'fort, and that therefore the Preaching of the 'Moral Law, is not to be allowed.

This is the English *Antinomianism* as full of Horrid Consequences, naturally flowing from it, as is the *German*, and as near a kin to *Liber-*

tinism, as I have shown in my Remarks on their *first Principle*.

This Particular Account of the *Antinomian* Errors, which is taken from the Reports made of them by the Greatest Adversaries to *Arminianism*, *Popery*, or *Socinianism*, is (as every body may see) directly opposite to the Doctrinal Articles of the Church of *England*, the *Westminster*, and *Savoy Confessions*, the *Larger*, and *Shorter Catechisms*, and Undoubtedly nothing more Detested by our Reverend Brethren, than these Abominations. They *are* far from making *Sin* and *Guilt* the same, the one Inseparable from the other; Or, of holding, that *the Promise of Justification*, or *Pardon*; *Adoption* and *Glory* belong to *Sinners as such*; or, that *all Sinners are actually in the sight of God Pardoned*, and Redeemed; Or, that the *Elect*, quâ *Elect*, *have a secret Hidden Right to the Heavenly Inheritance*, for this would be to vacate the Satisfaction and Merit of Christ; which is the only Foundation of their Right. And this they have, not merely as *Elect*; but as *Christ's Seed*, in which sense the Covenant of Grace is made with them. Besides, the *Right*, Resulting from Christ's Righteousness, and made theirs, as they are Christ's Seed, is theirs, and no otherwise, than as they themselves are *Christs*, which is after a Twofold manner, *Virtually*, or *Actually*. All the Elect being given to Christ their Head, are Christ's *Virtually*, ever since Christ was set up to be a Head or *second Adam*; and as such can only have a *Virtual Right*. But, when Born again, Spirit of Spirit, and are *actual Descendents* from Christ's Loins: United to him by Faith,

Faith, *then*, and not till *then*, have they an *actual Right* to the Heavenly *Inheritance*. This, I am perſwaded, is the *utmoſt* our Brethren mean, and is the ſame *Truth* aſſerted in the *ſubſcribed Propoſitions*, where it's expreſs.

1. 'That the Covenant of Grace was made 'with Chriſt as the ſecond *Adam*, and in him 'with all the Elect, as his Seed.

2. 'That in this Covenant of Grace, Salva'tion by Jeſus Chriſt is Freely offered to Sin'ners, He requiring of them Faith, as *the Con'dition* to Intereſt them in Himſelf.

3. 'That tho' God did from all Eternity 'Decree to *Juſtifie* all the *Elect*, and *Chriſt* did 'in the *Fulneſs of time* die for their Sins, and 'Riſe again for their *Juſtification*; yet never'theleſs they are not Juſtified, until the Holy 'Spirit *doth in* Due time actually apply Chriſt 'unto them, and the Spirit *Applieth* to us the 'Redemption Purchaſed by Chriſt, by work'ing Faith in us, and thereby *Uniting us to* 'Chriſt *in our Effectual* Calling.

4. 'That we may Eſcape the *Wrath*, and 'Curſe of God, *Due to* Us by reaſon of the 'Tranſgreſſion of the *Law*, He Requireth of us 'Repentance *towards God*, Faith towards our 'Lord Jeſus Chriſt. That Repentance unto 'Life is an *Evangelical* Grace, the *Doctrine* 'whereof is to be Preached by every Miniſter 'of the Goſpel, as well as that of *Faith* in 'Chriſt. That it is of ſuch Neceſſity to all 'Sinners, that none can Expect Pardon with'out it.

5. 'That the *Moral Law* doth for ever bind 'all, as well Juſtified Perſons, as others, to the

'Obe-

'Obedience thereof; and that not only in Regard of the *Matter* contained in it; But also 'in respect of the *Authority* of God the Creator, 'who gave it; neither doth Christ in the *Gospel* 'any way *Dissolve*, but much Strengthen *this* 'Obligation. That this *Law* is of great Use to 'Believers as well as *others*, in that, as a *Rule of* 'Life, informing them of the Will of God, 'and their Duty, it *Directs*, and *Binds* them to 'walk accordingly; Discovering also the sinful 'Pollutions of *their Nature*, *Hearts* and *Lives*; 'so as *Examining* themselves thereby, they may 'come to further Conviction of, Humiliation 'for, and Hatred against Sin; together with a 'a clearer sight of the Need they have of Christ, 'and the Perfection of his Obedience. It is 'likewise of Use to the Regenerate, to *Restrain* 'their *Corruptions*, in that it Forbids Sin, and 'the Threatnings of it serve to show, what 'even their Sins Deserve, and what Afflictions, 'in *this Life*, they may expect for them, altho' 'Freed from the Curse thereof Threatned in 'the *Law*. The Promises of it in like manner 'shew them God's Approbation of Obedience, 'and what Blessings they may *Expect*, upon 'the Performance *thereof*, altho' not as *Due* to 'them by the *Law*, as a *Covenant of Works*; so 'as a Man's *Doing Good*, and *Refraining from Evil*, 'because the Law *Encourageth* to the *one*, and 'Deterreth from the *other*, is no Evidence of his 'being under the *Law*, and not under *Grace*.

These *Propositions* are so directly opposite unto the *Antinomian* Doctrines, that it's Impossible for an *Intelligent*, and *sincere Subscriber* to Approve of Antinomianism. The vacating

vacating the Law, and making the Preaching thereof *Uſeleſs*, the actual Juſtification of a Sinner in the ſight of God before Faith, and the like, are in words expreſly Exploded by the Aſſembly, and ought to be witneſſed againſt by Sound and Faithful Miniſters.

Thus much may ſuffice for the clearing our Brethren from the Charge of *Antinomianiſm*, whoſe Principles are to be Judged by their *Subſcriptions*; and not by an Inaccurate, Obſcure or Perplex'd Paſſage in a Sermon, or Polemical Diſcourſe.

What *Antinomianiſm* is, and *How* Inconſiſtent with the Subſcribed Articles, and Confeſſions, hath been Particularly Declared, and yet it's further neceſſary, before I Proceed to the Conſideration of the *Socinian*, and thoſe other Errors in Controverſie, that I do my Part to clear ſome *Important Truths* from the Reproach of *Antinomianiſm*, and Vindicate the Firſt *Reformers* from the Unjuſt Charge of Eſpouſing ſo Groſs an Hereſie, which that I may the more Convincingly do, I will in ſeveral Inſtances ſhew what is not *Antinomianiſm*.

Firſt then, 'It is not *Antinomianiſm* to Aſſert, 'That Jeſus Chriſt is a *Second Adam*, a 'Publick Repreſentative of a Spiritual Seed; 'and, that the *Covenant of Grace* was made 'with Chriſt, as a Second *Adam*; and with the 'Elect, as his *Seed*.

This is a Notion expreſly affirm'd by the *Weſtminſter Aſſembly*, and not only ſo, but directly Oppoſite to ſeveral main Branches of that *Antinomian* Error, Supplying us with Invincible Arguments againſt it.

If

If Jesus Christ be a *Second-Adam*, it must be granted, that there is a *Similitude*, a *Resemblance*, and *Agreement* in some Third between him and the *First-Adam*. That this Agreement lyeth in these Particulars, namely, As the One is a *Father* of an Off-spring; so the other: And, as the Off-spring of the One bears the *Image* of their Father; so is it with the Off-spring of the other; And as the Posterity of the First *Adam* derive any thing from him, after the same manner do the Posterity of the Second from him.

Thus the *First Adam* is a *Type*, or *Figure* of the *Second, who was to come*. And, *as we have born the Image of the Earthy Adam*; so *shall we bear the Image of the Heavenly*: And, as by *the Disobedience of one many are made Sinners*; so by the Obedience of another, are many made *Righteous*. Whence it follows,

Rom. 5. 19.

1 Cor. 15.

1. That as *Guilt*, the Immediate Result of *Adam*'s Sin (and not his Personal Sin) was made the *Guilt* of all his Posterity, descending from him by Ordinary Generation: So the Righteousness, the Immediate Result of Christ's Personal Holiness; and not the Personal Holiness it self, is made the Righteousness of Christ's Spiritual Off-spring.

2. As the *Seed* of the *First Adam* may be be considered either as Virtually, and Seminally in him; or as *Actually* Descended from him; and *as Seminally* in him, they are only *Virtually* Guilty; *As Actually* born of him are actually Guilty: In like manner the Seed of the second *Adam* must be look'd on as *Virtually*, and *Seminally* in him; or *as Actually* born of him. In the first sence, they canbe but *Virtually Justified*,

Justified, and not *Actually* till actually born of him by a Spiritual Regeneration.

3. As the *Imputation* of *Adam*'s Guilt to all his Off-spring is founded on a Natural, and Federal Union between *Adam*, and *his Posterity*; so the *Imputation* of Christ's Righteousness to his Spiritual Off-spring, is grounded on a *Spiritual*, and *Federal*, or Covenant-Union between him, and them. Whence it follows,

That no Elect Person, merely as *Elect*, can be, either *Actually* or *Virtually*, Justified, That Justification, which is by Christ's Righteousness Imputed and by Faith Receiv'd, doth Immediately flow from the Elect Persons being *Christ's Seed*.

The Covenant of Grace being made with Christ as *Head*; and with the *Elect*; not meerly as *Elect*, but as *Christ's Seed*; Justification, the Great Covenant-Blessing belongs to none, but as they are in Covenant with Christ, that is, as they are *Christ's Seed*.

A *Decretive* Justification belongs to the Elect as *such*: But this gives no Right to the Heavenly Inheritance, The utmost Import of it is, that God did from all Eternity *Purpose* in himself, that such and such Particular Souls should be Christ's *Seed*, and as such be Justified. This Inward and Eternal Purpose, tho', it be a Topick from whence the *certainty* of the Justification of the Elect in the *Way*, and *manner* Ordained of God, is clearly Inferr'd: Yet doth it not give any Being thereunto So that notwithstanding the *Decree*, which *nihil ponit in esse*, an Elect Person may be so far from having any Right, secret and hidden; manifest,

or

or known, that he may be the Child of the first *Adam*, and as such, Really Guilty, that is, obnoxious, and liable to the Curse, which is wholly incompatible with a Real Right to Impunity; or the Reward. Nothing more manifest than that a Right to an Estate results not from an Internal Purpose of giving it. It is not the *Purpose*, but the Promise, that gives Right, and the Promise is not to the Elect, as such, but to the Elect, as Christ's *Seed*.

That all the *Elect* are given unto Christ, is manifestly True, but their *Right* Results from their being *Christ's*, who as such have the Promise made unto them. *According to the Eternal* Purpose, *was the* Promise *given us* in Christ *before the World began*.

2 Tim. 1. 9. Tit. 1. 2.

The Decree not giving Being to what is *Purposed*, it doth not hinder the Execution of that Part of the Counsel of God, according unto which the *Elect* are the *Off-spring*, both of the *First*, and *Second Adam*, which cannot be at the same time, but successively it is. Tho' *Virtually* and *Seminally*, in different Respects, an Elect Person may be considered, as the *Seed* of the *First*, and *Second Adam*; and when actually a Descendant from the *First Adam*, he may be look'd on as *Virtually* the Seed of the Second: yet *Actually*, he cannot be at the same time the *Seed of both*. On his being born of Christ he ceaseth to be a Child of the first *Adam*, and of Wrath, but not till then; He must be actually a Descendant from the second *Adam*, and be by Faith United unto Christ, before he can be actually Justified, which is a Truth, that strikes at the very Sinews of *Antinomianism*, and therefore

fore whatever the *Arminian* or *Socinian* may affirm of it; Or how much soever the *Antinomian* may *Abuse* it; 'tis most Opposite unto Error, 'Tis *Orthodox*, and *Sound*.

Secondly, To affirm, 'That *not only the Punishment, but the Guilt of Sin was laid on Christ*, 'is *not Antinomianism*.

The *Papists* will have it, that Christ bore the *Punishment* of our Sin, but not the *Guilt*. The *Socinians*, who see the Connection there is between Guilt and Punishment, how that wheresoever Punishment is Justly laid, there *Guilt* must be, are Positive, that nor the *Guilt* nor the *Punishment of Sin* was on Christ. The Guilt, and Punishment are Relatives, so that where no Guilt, there (saith *Socinus*) no Punishment can be. And it must be yielded, That Punishment hath an Essential respect unto Sin, it must be *for Sin*, or it cannot be Punishment; and it cannot be for Sin on whom no Sin is, either *Inherently*; Or, by *Imputation*. Sin Inherently could not be in him, who knew no Sin. Nor can there be the Imputation of Sin, but by transferring its *Guilt* unto him.

Relativa enim sunt Pœna & Delictum: ita ut ubi delictum non est, ibi pœna esse nullomodo possit. Socin. de Servat. Part 3. c. 10.

That Christ *suffer'd*, was *wounded*, and bruised for our Sins is in too many Places, throughout the Holy Scriptures, asserted, to admit of a Denial. But Christ could not *justly* suffer for our Sins, unless in a sound sence, he bore the *Guilt* of them. To Punish the Innocent as Innocent, is Injustice. Jesus Christ therefore tho' Innocent in himself, voluntarily becoming our Surety, took on him the *Guilt* of Sin, and suffer'd *Justly*; because as being *Guilty*.

To

To clear this, is the Difficulty, and many, in the Attempt, fall into dangerous Miſtakes. They, who make Sin and Guilt the ſame thing, by aſſerting the Guilt to be laid on Chriſt, *Quantum in ſe*, do make Chriſt *Inherently* a Sinner; which is *Antinomianiſm*; and they, who ſay the *Puniſhment* of Sin was laid on Chriſt, but not the Guilt, give up the Cauſe to the *Socinian*; For if not the Guilt, then nor the Puniſhment; whence no Satisfaction.

The *Guilt* lyeth between the *Sin* and its *Puniſhment*. It is an Obnoxiouſneſs unto Puniſhment for *Sin*; which, as it Reſults from the *Sin*, or *Fault*, is called the *Guilt* of the *Fault*; But, as it reſpects the Puniſhment, being an Obligation thereunto, 'tis *Guilt* of *Puniſhment*.

This Guilt is not *Intrinſick* to the *Sin*; The Sin is Entire without it; It is only an *External* reſpect of it to the Sanction of the Law, and *Separable* from the Sin it ſelf, the ἀναύλα, ſo that tho' the Sin Remain in us, the Guilt Paſſeth from us to Chriſt.

The Entire Nature of Sin lyeth in a Reſpect unto the Preceptive Part of the Law, being (as hath been already Obſerved) a Tranſgreſſion, or a Want of Conformity unto it. The Sin, is in its *Formal Nature*, Entire, without any Regard to the *Sanction*. From this *Sin*, as it reſpects the *Threatning*, Reſults *Guilt*; which is an Obnoxiouſneſs unto Puniſhment; or, the *Dignitas Pœnæ propter Culpam*, and is Extrinſick to the Sin, ſeparable from it, and may be laid on him, who never tranſgreſs'd the Commandment. Nor can it *morally* Defile, or Pollute the Perſon on whom it is laid.

Chriſt

Christ therefore, tho' in him there was no *Sin*, might bear the *Guilt* of our Sins, and nevertheless remain *Pure*, *Harmless*, *Undefiled*, and *without Spot*; which is sufficient to Vindicate this Doctrine from *Antinomianism*, and those other Absurdities that flow from the making Sin, and Guilt the same thing, and yet hold it to have been laid on Christ.

What I have here deliver'd amounts to no more than what is carried in that Common Distinction of our *Sins* being laid on Christ, not *Inherently*, but by *Imputation*. If the Sin, in its *formal Nature*, had been on Christ, there would have been Ground enough for that Charge of Blasphemous Consequences, which *Bellarmine*, and the *Socinians* load us with. *That* would, indeed, be to make Christ *Inherently a Sinner*, ay, *Filius Diaboli*. But to deny *this*; and affirm, that Christ was made *Sin*, *Only* by *Imputation*, that is, by the laying the *Guilt* of our Sins, not only the *Punishment*, but the *Guilt* on him, is consistent with his Freedom from all *Moral Filth*, or Defilement; and is necessary to Defend the Gospel Doctrine of *Christ's Satisfaction* against the *Socinian*; for, as KROMAYERUS well expresses it, *Absq; Peccatorum Imputatione, & Penarum Perpessione, Satisfactionem hic nullam cogitari posse.*

Kromayer. Theol. Pol. Pos. Art. xi. De Justif. p. 631.

CHAP. IV.

What Antinomianism *is not*, in *some other Instances Cleared*, *To Deny the* Conditionality of the Covenant of Grace, *not* Antinomian. *The State of this Controversie*, as *managed by the* Papists, and First Reformers. *The sence of the* Arminians, *and* Socinians *about* Condition. *Faith a* Condition, *Asserted. In what sence.*

IT is not *Antinomianism* to Deny the Conditionality of *the Covenant of Grace.*

There is not, it may be, any one Point in the Body of Divinity of greater Difficulty than this about the *Covenant of Grace*, and its *Conditionality.* They that search deeply into the many Controversies agitated between *us*, the *Papist*, *Arminian*, *Socinian*, and *Antinomian*; will find that the most Important Parts of it Turn on this *Hinge.* The *Papist*, *Arminian*, and *Socinian* cannot see, how the *Covenant of Grace* could be made with Jesus Christ, as a *Second Adam*; and with the *Elect*, as *his Seed*, which is One Reason of their many Mistakes. And the *Antinomian* fixeth his thoughts so very much on the *Covenant of Grace's* being made with Christ, that there is no Room left him to Consider, how it can be made also with his Seed; which occasions their Asserting, That Christ perform'd the *whole* requir'd of us in order to our being

being actually Interested in him, and his Benefits; as well as make *Satisfaction* by his Sufferings; and *Merit* by his Righteousness for them that Believe: That Christ Believed, and Repented for us, as if there had been no other Reason for our Doing either, than to Obtain the Knowledge of our having what actually was ours, whilst under the Power of *Unbelief*, and *Impenitency*.

But, it not being my Province to enter on a Large Debate of these things, I will only shew, that there are such *Senses*, in which the word [*Condition*] is used by the *Papists*, *Arminian*, and *Socinian*, as do Confound *Gospel Grace* with the *Law of Works*, and establish *Merit*; *Destroy the Doctrine* of the *Spirits working the* First *Grace*; and *subvert Christ's satisfaction*, and so make it Evident, That One, who Detests *Antinomianism*, may yet Deny the *Conditionality* of the *Covenant of Grace*.

If the word [*Condition*] when spoken of the *Two Covenants*, namely, of *Works*, and *Grace*, be taken in the *same* sence in both, the one will be Confounded with the other.

To Evince thus much, I will shew the Import of the *Condition* of the *Covenant* of *Works*, and how it agrees with the *Popish* Doctrine of *Merit*, and leave it to the Judgment of the Impartial Reader to consider the *Truth* of my Assertion.

The *Condition* of the Covenant of Works is *ea res, quæ Præstita, dat Jus ad Præmium*. It is that Obedience, to which the Promise was made; and from the Performance of which, a Right to the Reward immediately Re-

sults, and for which, in Justice, it is due.

This *Condition*, being Perfect Obedience, was to a *Law*, enforc'd with *Rewards* and *Punishments*, which Obedience, the Reward becoming due to it, *ex Justitia*, is *Meritorious*. And as, on the Rendring the Required Obedience, the Reward is Justly Due; so, seeing the *Performance* of the *Condition*, is the same with the Render of Perfect Obedience, the Blessing Promised is thereon Justly due unto it; and the Performing the Condition is *meritorious*; for Merit is nothing but that *Actio quâ Justum est, in Agenti aliquid Detur.*

There is much, much variety (I must confess) amongst the *Papists* in stating their Doctrine of Merit, but the Prevailing Opinion is, That *Merit*, and *Reward*, Essentially Respect one another. That Merit is a Good Work freely done, to which some Reward as a certain Price is Justly *Due*, that between the Merit and the Reward there is some sort of Equality. Thus *Aquinas*, *Cajetan*, *Medina*, and *Gregory de Valentia*.

The Reward, being made *ex justitia*, Due, *Merit of Congruity* is denied to be Merit in a *Proper* sence. So *Gregory de Valentia*, Merit of Congruity is but Improperly Merit. "The Distinction of Merit into that of *Congruity*, and *Condignity*, is not (saith *Alfonsus à Castro*) held by all the Schoolmen, for some Reject

Meritum & Merces ad Idem referuntur, Tho. 1a, 2æ. Q. 114. Art. 1.

Exhibitio *Meritis* & Redditio *MERCEDIS*, *actus ad alterum sunt secundum æqualitatem Rei ad Rem, scil.* Meriti *ad* Mercedem, *& è converso.* Cajet. in Loc.

Meritum est opus bonum liberum cui ex justitia Merces Debetur. Medin. in Loc.

Gregory de Valentia hath it thus,---*Per aliquem Justitiæ modum, aliquo munere Compensari à Deo debeat.* In Tho. Disp. 8. Quæst. 6. Punct. 1.

Meritum improprie dictum ---*vocatur Meritum de Congruo* Val. *ubi sup.*

Aliqui Scholasticorum Meritum de Congruo prorsus Rejiciunt, tanquam id, quod Meritum dici nequaquam meretur.

'ject *Merit of Congruity*, as what 'can by no means be truly called '*Merit*, because in this instance 'the Reward is not *Due*, either 'from any *worth* in the *Work it* 'self; nor *made Due* by the Law: 'but only from a mere Congrui- 'ty or Condecence, a Reward 'is freely given. *Becanus* affirms the same, for (as he words it) 'The Reward doth not certainly 'belong to him, who is said thus 'to *Merit*; for tho' it appears to 'Us very Congruous for God to 'Reward this or the other Per- 'son, for this or the other thing, 'yet on the contrary there are 'Reasons *Congruous* to God for 'his *Not Rewarding* them.

Propterea, quod illi neq; ex dignitate sua, *neq; ex Lege debetur Præmium, sed ex sola congruitate, gratis acceptatur ad Præmium.* Alfons. à Castro *de Hæresib.* Lib. XI. *in* Verb. Opera. Hæres. 4.

Alterum Meritum de Congruo Proprie non habet rationem Meriti, sed tantum cujusdem Congruentiæ, ac proinde non est necesse de eo Disputare. Nihil enim certi de eo affirmare possumus. Sic tum videri potest NOBIS congruum, & conveniens, ut Deus hoc vel illud præstet huic vel illi homini; Ita è contrario non desunt DEO Rationes congruentes, cur id nolit Præstare, quod alioqui apparet Congruum, ut Præstet. Becan. Opusc. Theol. Opusc. 7. cap. 3. P. inibi 203.

But that the *Work* may be *Properly Meritorious*, and the Reward be *Justly* due to it, it must be *Free*, not *Forced*; Forced acts being more Brutal, than Rational can't Please God: It must be a Work done in Obedience to God's Law; by *One* that is *in via*, and Reconcil'd unto God. All others being full of Sin can Merit nothing but *Punishment*, whence the Meritorious Work must flow *from Grace*, which is freely bestowed, and not merely from the Intrinsick virtue of the Work it self, but from the Ordination and Promise of God.

The Schoolmen Generally Distinguish Merit *ex Justitia* into that which is, *De Rigore Justitiæ*, and what is *ex Condigno*. *Sancta Clara*,

Scio enim viros Theologos Eckium, Marsilium apud Vegam Q. 4. Et Bellarminum, & alios negare Omne meritum de Condigno, *licet concedant de* Digno, *respectu Beatitudinis, Sancta. Clar. Dnus Nat. & Grat. Prob. 18. de Merit. p. 113.*

Meritum de Rigore Justitiæ est quod non innititur gratiæ, aut Misericordiæ sed habet valorem ex sese, & ex Persona offerente, quale est Meritum Christi, Medin. in Prim. Sec. Q. 114. Art. 3.

Meritum quidem Christi potest dici Meritum ex Justitia, *ratione Personæ offerentis, & sic non innitebatur* Gratiæ acceptantis, *sed dignitati suæ personæ, & rei Oblatæ, secus autem valde est in nobis, ubi ex parte personæ, & rei Oblatæ, SUMMA PAUPERTAS, si excludas Dei Promissionem acceptationis, vel Pactionem Retributionis. Sanct. Clar. ubi sup.*

Clara, indeed saith, That *Eckius*, and *Marsilius, in Vega*, as also *Bellarmine*, with some others, Deny *Merit, de Condigno*, holding a Merit only *ex Digno*. Not to trouble our selves with these Niceties, I must observe, that (whatever *Arriaga* suggests to the contrary) *Merit*, ex *rigore Justitiæ*, is what ariseth from the Work it self, and Worth of the Person, that doth it, and not from God's Gracious and Merciful Acceptance. This They Assign to Christ alone. So *Medina*.

Sancta Clara, who gives us the sense of the *Scotists*, speaks much to the same purpose, 'The Merit 'of Christ (says he) may be cal-'led Merit *Ex Justitia*, because of 'the *Excellency* of the *Person*, of-'fering it, whereby, it doth not 'Depend so much on the *Grace* 'of God accepting *it*, as on the 'worth of his Person. It's much 'otherwise with us, whose *Per-'sons*, and *Works*, considered in 'themselves, abstract from the 'Promise of a Gracious Acceptance, and the 'Covenant of Retribution, are *Poverty it self*.

Alfonsus de Castro, and *Gregory de Valentia* delivering the Sense of the Church of *Rome* with much Clearness, and Candor, I will, to find out their Genuine sense, if possible, Give what they write of it.

'If

'If *Luther* (saith *Alfonsus*) takes '*Merit* for such a Work, as in its 'own Nature, and of it self is E-'qual with the Reward, and in 'that sense Denies it, He is not 'to be blamed. For there is no 'Work of ours, that can thus be '*Equal* with the Eternal Glory. 'For, as the Apostle, *I Reckon, that 'the Sufferings of this Present Life 'are not to be compared with the 'Glory, which shall be Revealed in 'us.* But *Merit* is not always ta-'ken to Import such an Equality 'and Natural Obligation. In the 'case before us, it Denotes only 'such an Equality, as arises from 'an *Agreement*, *Compact*, or *Cove-'nant*; on which account that 'Work, which before was not 'Equal with the Reward, *now* is '*made so*: And what was not 'a Debt before, is made a Debt; 'which Debt, in God, doth not 'arise from our Works, from a-'ny Dignity in them: But from 'the Benignity of God, who making Gracious 'Promises *Obligeth* himself, whereby he is *in-'debted*, not to *us*, but to his *Promise*.—This Pro-'mise is *Simply*, and Absolutely, to be Ascribed 'to *his* Grace.

Si Lutherus *accipit meritum pro tali opere quod ex sua natura, & ex se ipso æquale est Præmio, certe illius sententia non est de errore notanda, quoniam non est aliquod opus nostrum ex se tale quod æquari possit Gloriæ æternæ. Alfon. à Castro. Avers. Hæres. Lib.* x. p. 23.

*Si nostra opera sint ex se in*digna Gloria, *& nos per illa* nullum ius *habere poteramus ad Gloriam Æternam--- tamen quia Misericors Deus Promisit servanti mandata sua --post talem Promissionem DEBET Deus dare gloriam —— Quod* Debitum *in Deo non* Oritur *ex* nostris Operibus, *sed ex* Benignâ ejus *voluntate, qui Promittens nobis, seipsum obligare voluit--- non dicimus Deum Obligari aut esse* Debitorem *nostris Operibus, sed eum* Obligari *EX PROMISSIONE SUA, & esse DEBITOREM PROMISSIONI SUÆ. Quod a Promisit ipse,* simpliciter, *&* absolute Tribuendum est GRATIÆ. *De Cast. ub. sup.*

'The Reward is not always 'made a Debt by the Nature of 'the Works, it being sufficient if

Satis est ut Præmium Debitum sit EX LEGE. *Nam Lex potest facere paria, quæ ex naturâ suâ erant Imparia. Lex naturæ docet, ut omne Promissum sit Debitum.*

'made *Due* by the Law. And the *Law* can 'make those things *Equal*, which in their own 'Nature, were not so. The Law of Nature 'teacheth us, that Every Promise is a *Debt*, 'whence it comes to pass, that by the Promise, 'those things, which were in themselves *Un-* 'equal, are made *Equal*.

'We are not so Ignorant, nor so much Ela- 'ted in our Conceit, as to Equa- 'lize the Intrinsick Value of our 'Works, which are most Incon- 'siderable, with the Transcen- 'ding Excellency, and Immense 'Worth of the Heavenly Glory. 'It is from the *Promise* and the '*Covenant* made with us that our 'Works which we are Enabled 'through the Grace of God to 'Perform, that makes them *wor-* 'thy of Eternal Life, which sepa- 'rated from the Promise, would be altoge- 'ther Unworthy. We are therefore wholly 'owing to the Unspeakable Mercy of God 'for our Merit, that he hath made so Glo- 'rious a Display of his Grace in this, That 'when he Owed us nothing, he did of his a- 'bundant Goodness to Enrich us, make himself 'a Debter. —— Nor let any calumniate us, 'as if we Detracted from the Merit of our 'Blessed Redeemer. None but 'they who understand not our 'Doctrine, can talk after this 'Rate. We have oft Declared,

Data hâc Promissione, & factâ nobiscum Conventione, Opera bona hominis cum Adjutorio Gratiæ Dei fiunt Digna vitâ æternâ, & illi æquilia, quæ seclusâ illâ Dei promissione, fuissent tanto Præmio Indigna. Et hâc fuit illa suprema Dei Misericordia, à quâ pendet totum meritum nostrum, &c. De Calvo ubi sup. in Verb. Opera. Lib. XI.

Quod a. homines & bona illorum Opera sint Deo Grata, & ad vitam æternam accepta, hoc habent ex MERITO CHRISTI, qui pro illis Passionem & mortem suam Deo Patri Obtulit, & pro illis omnibus quos scivit esse ad gloriam Prædestinatos, oravit. Ub. sup.

'It

'It is not of our selves, that our Good Works 'Merit Eternal Life: But we, and *our Works*, 'are Rais'd to this Dignity merely through the 'Divine Clemency, by which he Promises to 'them, who Obey him, Eternal Life.——And 'that they are thus Rais'd, is through the *Merit of Christ*, who offered himself a Sacrifice, and 'Prayed Earnestly for all them he knew were 'Predestinated to Eternal Life. From this 'therefore, as from the Chief and Principal 'Merit, all Grace and Glory is Derived, and 'from *this*, it is, that Just Men, and their Works 'are freely Ordinated to Eternal Life. This and much more hath *Alfonsus de Castro* about Merit *de Condigno*, which is highly applauded by *Gregory de Valentia*, whose Endeavours are to Raise it to a Merit by the Rule of *Commutative Justice*. Not that he thinks our Good Works have any such Intrinsick worth in them, as Equalizes them with Eternal Glory, for he grounds *that* on the Gracious *Ordination* and *Promise* of God, (as the *Papists* generally do) and illustrates it thus. Suppose a *Prince* by his Ordinance puts an Extraordinary Value on Money of a base Alloy, by this means, tho' the Money in it self, and abstract from the Regal Constitution, falls very short of the thing, for which 'tis *Commuted*; yet, by Virtue of the Royal Ordinance it's made of *Equal Price* with it; and so it must pass in Bargains by the Rules of *Commutative* Justice. The same he saith

De solo Merito ex Condigno loquimur. Alfons. de Cast. Ub. sup.

Ac possumus hoc totum Exemplo facili declarare. Nam si Pecuniæ alicui Principis, fiat ex vili aliqua materia, quæ Vid. ex Naturâ suâ consideratæ non tantum valeat, quantum Res quæ pro ista sunt Commutandæ, tunc quidem si Pecuniæ hæc, absolute sine Respectu ad Principis Constitutionem Consideretur, certum est, Eam secundum justitiæ Commutativæ Rationem, non esse Equalem iis Rebus, quas potest aliquis pro Eâ Consequi: bene au-

of

tem si Consideretur, ut subsistat Constitutioni & Legi Principis, qua decretum est, ut qui hujusmodi Pecuniam exhiburit, Consequatur Res Necessarias secundum factam Pecuniæ taxam. Nam si hac Ratione Consideretur hujusmodi Pecunia, tanti merito æstimabitur, quanti Res ipsæ quæ per Eam Comparari possunt. Ita prorsus se habet Res in proposito. Nam si bonum opus Justi consideres præcisè ex se, non est æquale Gloriæ; Si autem ut subsistat divinæ Promissioni ob quam per illud certo potest Comparari Gloria; tanti potest æstimari, quanti illa atq; patronus est æquale Gloriæ. Greg. de Valen. p. 1275.

of Good Works, which, considered in themselves separate from the Divine *Ordination*, and *Promise*, are not to be compared with the Glory, yet having so *great a Value put upon them by God's Ordination*, they are after a sort made Equal with Eternal Life, and Merit according to *Commutative Justice*.

To Improve what is taken out of these *Popish* Writers, about *Merit of Condignity*, it must be observ'd;

1. That altho' the Reward Infinitely excel the Work in its own Nature considered; and that the Promise be simply and absolutely Free, and it is Impossible for a Just Man to do the good Work, without the *Help of God's Grace*; yet the Work thus done may be Meritorious *ex Condigno*. All these things they allow, and yet make good Works *Meritorious*.

2. That this Merit lying in a *Duness* of the Reward to the good Work *ex Justitia*, it is founded *in the Promise*. We are, say they, under a *Law*, which has, not only a Preceptive, but a Promisory Part, whence because of the Connexion there is between Obedience to the Precept, and the Promise, a Right to the Reward immediately Results from the Obedience, or good Work. The good Work gives Right to the Reward, that is, it Merits the Reward, and the Reward is *justly* due for that Obedience.

But

But here they are at a Plunge, how to state this Matter so as to make the Reward due *ex Justitia*, the Promise as a single Promise being insufficient for their Purpose.

The *Objection* that lyeth against them is this, If the Meritorious Act be *so*, only from the Divine Promise, or God's Gracious Acceptation, then the Reward cannot be *ex Justitiâ*, the good Work may be done, and God not oblig'd in *Justice* to give the Reward. The utmost that can be said is this, God in *Faithfulness* is bound by his Promise to Reward the Doer, but not in *Justice*; and yet unless God be in *Justice* bound, the Work cannot be meritorious *ex Condigno*. To this Objection their Answer (as I find it in *Sancta Clara*) is, that the fulfilling a *Naked Promise*, is only an Act of *Fidelity* and *Faithfulness*: But, the fulfilling a *Covenant Promise*, which is made on Condition, as between a Master and Servant, where the Master Promises a Reward on *Condition* of such a Service, here, for the Master to fulfil the Promise to his Servant on his Performing the *Condition*, is an Act of Justice, which is (say they) our Case.

Dicit, si Actus Meritorius est talis solum Promissionis Divinæ seu ejus acceptationis, ergo non ex justitia, *sed ex fidelitate præmiabitur. Quod est Contra Definitionem Meriti de Condigno. Respondeo quod adimplitio Promissionis nudæ est solum Actus Fidelitatis; adimplitio vero Promissionis, quæ habet Naturam Pacti, id est ubi à Promissario exigitur Conditio, sicut inter Dominum & servum, ubi Dominus promittit stipendium ex Conditione servitutis adimplenda illius Promissio est ex justitia. Sic in Casu. Sancta Clar. Dtus. Nat. Grat. p. 111.*

Thus to make good Works meritorious, they assert a *Law*, with a Promise; making the Dignity of the Work to lean on the *Promise*: And that the Reward may be Due *ex justitia*, the *Law* is turn'd into a *Covenant*, where

Obe-

Obedience to the Preceptive Part is made the *Condition*, that giveth Right to the Reward. So that it is that *Conditionality* of the Covenant, on which the *Merit of Condignity* is founded. All which is undoubtedly true of the Covenant given *Adam*. For if he had but rendred the Perfect Obedience required by the Preceptive Part of the Law; or, which is the same, if he had Perform'd the *Condition* of that Covenant made with him; it would have given him a *Right* to the Reward, it would have been in *Justice* due to him, that is, he would have *merited* it *Ex Condigno*.

Tho' his *Temporary* Obedience fell infinitely short of the Reward of *Eternal* Life; yet because of the Promise made on a *Covenant-Condition*, giving Right; the Reward, on his performing the Condition, would have been *Due* to him *ex justitia* (i. e.) he would have merited it *Ex Condigno*.

In like manner, if the word [*Condition*] when assign'd to the *Covenant of Grace*, be taken in this sense, *viz.* for *that thing, which, being Perform'd, gives* Right *to the* Reward, the Covenant of *Grace* is Confounded with that of *Works*, and *Merit of Condignity* effectually established.

'Tis Confounded with the *Covenant of Works*, and made a Covenant of the *same kind* with it, for in both, as there is a *Precept* enjoyning Duty, and a Promise of *Reward*; even so, notwithstanding the Work falls infinitely shore of the *Reward*, yet the Reward being Promised on a *Condition*, giving Right; A Right unto it Results from the Performance of the *Condition*, and the Reward is due *ex justitia*, and so Merit of *Condignity* is also established. Nor

Nor can it signifie any thing to say, we exclude all *Merit* from our Good Works, by ascribing all to the *Grace* of God, enabling us; and nothing to our own *Strength*, making their Rewardableness to Lean on the *Ordination*, and *Promise* of God, For the *Papists* make all these Necessary to Merit *ex Condigno*; affirming, That unless the Work proceed from Grace, it cannot be meritorious of Eternal Life, and that they give not any *Dignity* to their Good Works, but acknowledge that in themselves considered and *Precise*; as separate from the Ordination of God they are of no worth, that their *Rewardableness* is founded on the *Promise*.

In these things lye the very *Nature* of *Merit*; for which reason, to deny our Works to be meritorious because their Rewardableness is founded on the Promise, it is as if, you would deny *Peter* to be a Man, because he is a Rational Creature.

That Grace is necessary to Merit the Papists industriously endeavor to Prove. *Certum ex fide est* (saith Gregory de Valentia) *Meritum Condignum esse Proprium effectum Gratiæ. Probatur. 1. ex Script. ad Rom. 6. Gratia Dei vita æterna. Ubi non est sensus,* Vitam æternam dari *GRATIS, sed dari tam pro meritis,* quæ *contulit GRATIA.*--Since me nihil potestis facere. *Possumus enim sine aliquid facere, si vitam æternam promereri valeremus, non* inviti *per gratiam* Christo, *tanquam* viti Palmites, *ut ipse ibi Loquitur. Valent. ubi sup.*

Summa igitur est, quod actus meus dicitur meritorius, quia elicitus, seu Imperatus à Gratia, ex Pactione Divina acceptatus ad Præmium, unde ipsa acceptatio est Intrinseca actui. Sanct. Clar. ub. sup.

This being the Doctrine held by the *Papists* about *Merit*, one Great Point Controverted between *them*, and *first Reformers*, was about Our Works being a Condition of *Eternal Life*, and accordingly in the *Council* of *Trent*

Si quis hominim Justificatum—— dixerit non teneri ad Observantiam mandatorum Dei, & Ecclesiæ: sed tantum ad Credendum, quasi vero Evangelium sit nuda & absoluta Promissio vitæ æternæ, sine Conditione Observationis *Mandatorum: Anathema sit. Concil. Trid. Sess. 6. Can. 20.*

it's

it's Decreed with an *Anathema*, 'That if any 'hold——we are not bound to Observe the 'Laws of God, and the Church, but only to 'Believe, as if the *Gospel* was but *a Naked, and* 'Absolute Promise of Eternal Life without a Con- 'dition of *Observing the Commands*. Let him be *Accursed*.

Epit. Hist. Eccles. ub. sup.

In the *Scholia* of the Reformed, on this *Canon*, as *Lucas Osiander* Represents it, their sense is manifest, for say they, 'The Assertion of the 'Council, that the Gospel is a Promise of Eter- 'nal Life on *Condition* of keeping the Com- 'mands, is altogether *False*, the Gospel Promise 'of Eternal Life leans not on a *Condition* of 'keeping the Commands, But Requires Faith, 'whereby we lay hold on the Mercy of God 'offered to us. If that Promise lean on such a 'Condition, no Christian can be certain of his 'Salvation.

Antidotum in Conc. Trid.

Calvin, on this very *Canon* is Positive, 'That 'the Apostles Placing the Difference between 'the Law and the Gospel is this, that the Gospel 'doth not Promise Eternal Life on the *Condition* 'of Works, as the *Law* did, but to *Faith*; is a 'standing Truth, that can never be shaken. 'What can be more clear than this *Antithesis*? 'The Righteousness of the Law is such, *That* Rom. 10. 5. *the man that doeth these things shall live in them*: 'But the Righteousness of *Faith* is after this Rom. 4. 14. 'manner, *He that Believeth*, &c. To the same 'Purpose is that other place. If *the Inheritance* 'be of the *Law*, then is *your Faith Vain*, and the 'Promise of no Effect, therefore it is of Faith, 'that of Grace, the Promise may abide Firm to 'every one, who believeth.

I might

I might give many Authorities more, but these are enough to make it Evident, that the *First Reformers* denied the Gospel to be a Promise of Eternal Life on *Condition* of our keeping the Commandments, which must be Understood to be in that sence, in which the *Papists* held it; that is, they denied our Good Works to be *such a Condition* of Eternal Life, as gave *Right unto it*, as a *Reward*, which may be done by them who are not *Antinomians*, which is very clear from the *Scholia* of the Reformed on the Nineteenth Canon of the Council, which is to this effect. *Let him be accursed*, who *holds, that nothing is Commanded in the Law*, but *Faith*; *That all other things are Indifferent*; and, *that the Ten Commandments belong not to Christians*. To which they Answer, 'That there is no such *Dogma* held by the Divines, who Subscrib'd the *Augustane Confession*, 'that none but one *Isiebius* was tainted with 'this False and Wicked Opinion, that *Luther* 'oppugned and confuted this Error, and brought 'its Author to a Recantation, and that the 'other Divines rejected it.

2. The word [*Condition*] is also taken in this very sense by the *Arminians*, who argue so very Plausibly from the Grant of *it*, against some Important Doctrines of the Christian Faith, that many Orthodox, and Judicious Divines are afraid to *Use* it.

They make it (If I may use the word) a *Legal Condition*, that is, Obedience to the Preceptive Part of a Law, giving Right to the Reward. 'It is that thing, which being 'Performed, gives Right to the *Blessing Pro-*

'*mised.*

Conditio, quatenus præstita est, aliquomodo Medium fieri dici potest, quo Consequimur Rem quæ sub Conditione Promittitur. Exam. Censur. Cap. 10. P. 112.

Conditio, cujus Præstatio Medium sive causa salutis aliquomodo dici potest, non modo est Gratiosa per se; sed & Gratia ad Eam præstandam propitium necessaria est, & Præmium Præstanti promissum extra & supra omnem Comparationem est. Ub. sup. Cap. 8. P. 95.

'mised. Or, it is *that* which being Perform'd, is a means by 'which we attain to what was 'on *Condition* promised. Again, 'Condition, whose Performance 'may be called a *Mean*, or *Cause* 'of *Salvation*, is, not only in it 'self full of Grace; but Grace is 'always necessary for the Ena'bling us to perform it, and the 'Reward Ptomised thereunto *In'finitely exceeds* it.

However, from the *Grant*, that our Faith is *such* a *Condition* of Eternal Life, they triumphantly oppugn some Important Truths. Particularly, they thus argue against *Christ's Meriting* Faith and *Regeneration* for the Elect. 'If Christ 'merited Faith, and Regenera'tion for us, (say they) then 'Faith cannot be a *Condition*, 'which God exacts from Sinners, 'under the Commination of E'ternal Death. They go Higher, 'affirming, That if Christ pur'chased the *First Grace* for Us, 'then the Father by virtue there'of, is obliged to give us Faith,

Si enim Christus nobis meritus dicatur Fidem & Regenerationem tum Fidei, Conditio esse non poterit, quam à Peccatoribus Deus sub Commitatione Mortis exigeret; imo tum Pater ex vi meriti istius obligatus fuisse dicatur necesse est, ad Conferendum nobis Fidem, & Efficiendum in nobis omnia, quæ nobis sub Commination Mortis præscribit, quo nihil absurdius Cogitari potest. Exam. Cens. Cap. 8. P. 59.

'and work all these things in us, which are pre'scribed under the *Threatning of Death*. Than 'which nothing can be more absurd. Such a 'Collation of Faith, flowing from Christ's *Me'riti*, doth effectually destroy the Divine Con'stitution, by which Faith is enjoyned Sinners, 'with a Promise of Life and Threatning of 'Death.

'Death. Thus much from the very Nature 'of the thing is most apparent—— If Christ be 'in this *way* our Saviour, he can't be our *Law-giver*, nor can our Faith, or Obedience be '*Acts of Duty*, they can be but Effects of 'Christ's Merit. Again they add, That the 'Prescription of a *Condition*, and an Efficacious 'working it in them to whom it is prescrib'd, 'are Incompatible. *That Condition*, is not a *Condition*, which 'is wrought in Him to whom it 'is prescribed, even by the Pre-'scriber. The mere Effect of a 'Prescriber cannot be a prescri-'bed, much less, a *Performed* 'Condition. He that gives a *Condition* to ano-'ther, will, that it be performed by that *other*. 'If it be wrought *in Him*, it ceaseth to be a 'Condition; and he that wrought it, doth by 'that very Act null it's being a Condition, 'because he will not have it done by that 'other, but will Himself work it in Him. 'Right Reason dictates thus much 'unto us—No Wise Man will 'act thus, nor can any thing be 'more ludicrous, these things are 'scarce fit for a Play. That 'Law-giver, who prescribes a 'Condition to them, whom he 'has Irrevocably Design'd for a Reward, will 'expose his Legislation to the utmost Con-'tempt.

Conditio non est Conditio, quæ ab Eo, qui Eam præscribit, in Eo cui præscribitur, efficitur. Meus Effectus Præscribentis non potest esse Conditio Præscripta, inquam Præstita. Exam. ub. sup. P. 106.

Hæc Actio ludicra tota & vix Scæna digna est.

Legislator serius, totam suam Legislationem ludibrio exponit, cum Conditionem Præscribit, iis quos irrevocabiliter Præmio afficere & in quibus, quam Præscribit Conditionem, ipse efficere vult.

They carry it yet further, asserting, 'This 'Condition to be Inconsistent with the Parti-'cular Election of a Select Number of Per-

Conditio omnis stulte & Ridicule Proponitur iis, qui nominatim & præcise jam ante destinati sunt saluti. Exam. Cens. c. 9. p 102.

Destinatio Irrevocabilis ad vitam, & Promissio vitæ sub Conditione, non nisi Stulte Conjunguntur. Exam. Ubi sup. p. 104.

'sons. A *Condition*, say they, 'is Foolishly, yea, Ridiculously 'Proposed to them, who are 'Particularly and by Name Or'dain'd to Salvation. An Irre'vocable Decree of Salvation, 'and the Promise of Life on '*Condition*, are most weakly Put 'together.

A *Condition*, they say, is that which when Performed, gives *Right* unto a *Reward*, That there is *Grace* glorified, in that the Reward Excels, Infinitely excels what is Requir'd of us as a *Condition*; and that help is vouchsafed for the Enabling us to Perform it. But then they add, That what is a Condition of our Interest in Christ's *Merits*, must be what was not *merited* for us by Christ. To make that a *Condition* of our Interest in the Benefits *merited by Christ*, that was *merited by Christ* is an *Inconsistence*; Or, to Affirm *that* to be a *Condition* Requir'd of us, which is not Performed by us, but wrought in us by him that Prescribes it, is the Greatest Folly; Or, to make the Salvation of any to Depend upon a Condition, that may, or may not be Performed, and yet assert the *certainty* of their Salvation flowing from the Unalterable Decree, is Ridiculous.

This is the Improvement the *Arminians* make of the Gospels being a Promise of Eternal Life, on *Condition*, namely, the denying Christ's meriting the *first Grace*, and the *Spirits working* it, and the *Doctrine* of *Particular Election*.

What Strength there is in their *Arguments*; or how Naturally these Consequences flow from

from the Assertion, [That *Eternal Life is Promised us on a* Condition *of our own Performance*; and, that *it is the* Result *of our Obedience*,] is not my Business at this time to Enquire: Only thus much is Clear; That they, who run not to the *Antinomian* Extreme, may, to Avoid these *Arminian* Rocks, Deny the *Conditionality* of the Covenant of Grace, at least in the sence the *Arminians* use the word [*Condition*]: Especially, considering, the *Plausibleness* of their *Reasoning*. Undoubtedly Men, *Orthodox* in the *Faith*, may be Influenced to Conclude, That the making *Faith* the *Condition* of an Interest in the *Merits* of Christ, and yet a Part of the Merit are so Inconsistent, that they cannot be both *True*; and that therefore, being Convinced, that *Faith* is merited by Christ, they *cannot* but Deny it's being a *Condition*. Besides, they may think, that this *sort* of Condition must have so much of our *own* in it, as interferes with the *Spirits working* the First Grace in *us*, and they Believing the First Grace to be *Absolutely* Bestowed on us, and *effectually* wrought in us, by the Spirit must necessarily *Deny its* being such a *Condition*, as *this*, we are Discoursing of. In fine, *Condition*, as Explained by *them*, and, as by some Jealous and Overwary Persons, suppos'd to be held by all, that Use that *word*, cannot stand with the Doctrine of Particular Election. For their *Condition* doth necessarily Infer Salvation to be Undetermined and Uncertain, it may be, or it may not be, Just as we our selves Determine.

The *Socinians* do not ſtrive a little to ſubvert Chriſt's *Satisfaction*, from this very Conſideration, That *the Remiſſion of Sin is offer'd on Condition.* A Zeal for the Advancement of Holineſs, and the Checking Debauchery, Provokes them (as they tell us) to Inſiſt on the *Conditionality* of our Faith and Repentance, and Oppugn the Doctrine of *Satisfaction.*

'This, among others, is one Cauſe, why '(ſaith *Smalcius*) we Reject the 'Dogma about *Satisfaction*, viz. 'Becauſe Men are apt to Con-'clude, That if a Full Satisfaction 'be made for their Sins, there is 'no *Need* of *their Repentance.* Be-'ſides, They Preſſing Repentance, 'as a *Condition* of *Pardon*, find 'themſelves under a Neceſſity 'of Denying *Satisfaction.*

Et hæc unâ eſt inter alias Cauſa, ob quam, Dogma ſatisfactionis prorſus ſit Repudiandum. Quia ſcilicet hominibus Perſuadere poſſet, non eſſe opus ullâ Reſipiſcentiâ, ſi quidem pro peccatis plena ſatisfactum eſt. Smalc. contra. Smiglec. c. xi. p. 286.

To evince thus much, 'twill be ſufficient to conſult once more *Smalcius*, who having affirm'd; That to Require Repentance of them, for whoſe Sins full Satisfaction had been made, was Unneceſſary, *Smiglecius* replies, *That Satisfaction doth not exclude Conditions* from him, for whom Satisfaction was *Offer'd.* For (ſaith he) who will Accept of Satisfaction for an Injury; if he, who did it, Perſiſts in his Enmity. To this *Smalcius* Rejoinds; Aſſuring us, 'That '*Smiglecius* doth not Prove, nor is it Probable, 'that *Conditions* may be Preſcribed to him, for 'whom a full Satisfaction is made. In this 'caſe the Creditor is bound to Diſcharge his 'Debter, without any Regard to his Future 'Demeanour. Of this, *Smiglecius*, being aware, 'changes

'changes the Terms, saying, Satisfaction doth 'not interfere with the Imposing a Condition 'on him, for whom Satisfaction is *Offer'd*, 'whereas, in the present Case *Satisfaction* is not 'only offer'd, but said to be Really made and 'Finish'd. Whence it's manifest, That seeing '*Conditions* and such a full Satisfaction are In-'compatible, and yet *Conditions*, for the Ob-'taining the Remission of Sins are strictly In-'joyned, there can be no True. Real Satisfa-'ction, There can be only a Free forgiveness 'of Sin without any Anteceding Satisfaction. 'This Assertion excludes not; but necessarily 'Infers *Conditions*. God freely offering us the 'Forgiveness of Sins, we must Repent and be 'Servants to our Lusts no longer; for, if we 'Repent not, the Offer'd Pardon will not be 'Given us. So far *Smalcius*, whose Argument can be of no force, unless the *Condition* Im-port somewhat that *Gives Right* to Pardon. If the Pardon of Sin be not the Immediate Re-sult of Christ's Satisfaction only, but some-what in us is moreover necessary to *Give Right* unto it, the Satisfaction is not Full, and if not full, it's none at all. If it be Adequate and Full, the Right Results only from *it*, and not from any thing *in us*, not from our Faith, Re-pentance, or any other Good Works. The Right to Impunity must Result from Christ's Satisfaction only; or not at all. If there be somewhat else from which it must Result, then hath not Christ made Full Satisfaction: a Con-dition therefore *giving Right*; Or Christ's Sa-tisfaction must be laid aside. They can never be together. The setting up the One, is a casting down the other.

This being the true State of the Case, the *Socinians* Unable to see, how the Necessity of our Holiness, and Good Works, can be maintain'd consistently with the laying aside Conditions; chose rather to part with the Doctrine of Christ's Satisfaction, than deny Faith, Repentance, *&c.* to be the *Conditions*, giving Right to Pardon.

If there be a full Satisfaction made by Christ for any Sinners, a Discharge (say the *Socinians*) must be immediately given them. They can't see any middle Way between themselves and the *Antinomian*. Justification must flow either Immediately from Christ's Satisfaction to the Elect whil'st in the Heigth of Iniquity, or from a *Condition* Perform'd by them, *Giving Right* thereunto. If the former that's *Antinomianism*; If the latter, then no Satisfaction, which is *Socinianism*.

Thus you see in what sense the word *Condition* is taken by the *Papist*, *Arminian*, and *Socinian*, and diversly Urged to Establish the Doctrine of our Merit, and Destroying those other about Christ's *Meriting* the *First Grace*, his *Spirits working* it, *Particular Election*, and *Christ's Satisfaction*, which Considerations may frighten Men. sound in the Faith, from the *Use* of the word; and Provoke the Generation of the Just to Reject it, unless, when *Used*, it be with an *Explication*.

What the Learned Dr. *O.* hath on this Occasion is worthy of our weightiest thoughts, who speaking of the Term [*Condition*] is Express, 'That the word is no where used in the Scripture in this matter: which I argue no farther

'(saith

'(saith he) but that we have no certain Rule, 'or Standard to try, and measure its Significa- 'tion by. Wherefore, it cannot *first* be intro- 'duced in what sense Men please, and then 'that sense turned into Argument for other 'Ends. For thus on a *Supposed Concession*, that 'it is the *Condition* of our Justification, some 'heighten it into a *Subordinate Righteousness* im- 'puted unto us *antecedently*, as I suppose, unto 'the Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ, 'in any sense, whereof it is the *Condition*: And 'some, who pretend to lessen its *Efficiency*, or '*Dignity* in the use of it in our *Justification*, 'say, it is only *Causa sine quâ non*, which leaves 'us at as great an Uncertainty as to the Nature 'and Efficacy of this Condition as we were 'before. Nor is the true sense of things at 'all Illustrated, but rather darkned by such 'Notions.

'*Conditio* in the best *Latine* Writers is vari- 'ously used; answering Κατάστασις, τυχὴ, ἀξία, αἰτία, 'συνθήκη, in the *Greek*; That is, *Status*, *Fortuna*, '*Dignitas*, *Causa*, *Pactum initum*. In which of 'their Significations it is here to be understood, 'is not easie to be determined. In *common use* 'among us, it sometimes denotes the State 'and Quality of Men, that is, κατάστασις and ἀξία; 'and sometimes a *valuable Consideration* of what 'is to be done, that is, αἰτία or συνθήκη. But 'herein, it is applied unto things in great *varie-* 'ty; sometimes the *Principal-Procuring-Purcha-* 'sing-Cause, is so expressed. As the *Condition* 'whereon a Man lends another an *Hundred* 'Pound, is, that he be Paid it again with In- 'terest. The *Condition* whereon a Man con-

'veyeth his Land unto another, is, that he Re-
'ceive ſo much Money for it. And ſome-
'times, it ſignifies ſuch things as are added to
'the Principal Cauſe, whereon its Operation
'is ſuſpended. As a man bequeaths an Hun-
'dred Pound unto another, on *Condition*, that
'he come or go to ſuch a Place and Demand
'it. This is no valuable Conſideration, yet is
'the *Effect* of the *Principal Cauſe*; or the *Will*
'of the Teſtator ſuſpended thereon. And as
'unto degrees of Reſpect unto *that*, whereof
'any thing is a *Condition*; as to Purchaſe, Pro-
'curement, Valuable Conſideration. *neceſſary*
'*Preſence*, the Variety is Endleſs. We there-
'fore cannot obtain a determinate ſenſe of this
'word, *Condition*, but from a *particular Decla-*
'*ration* of *what* is *intended* by it, *wherever it is*
'*uſed*. And although this be not ſufficient to
'exclude the *uſe* of it from the Declaration of
'the way and manner, *how* we are *juſtified* by
'*Faith*; yet it is ſo to exclude the Impoſition of
'any Preciſe ſignification of it, any other than
'is given it by the Matter treated of. Without
'this, every thing is left Ambiguous, and un-
'certain whereunto it is Applied.

'For Inſtance; It is commonly ſaid, That
'*Faith and New Obedience* are the Condition of
'the *New Covenant*. But yet, becauſe of the
'*Ambiguous* ſignification and various uſe of that
'Term (*Condition*) we cannot certainly under-
'ſtand what is intended in the Aſſertion. If
'no more be intended but that God *in, and by*
'the New Covenant doth Indiſpenſably re-
'quire theſe things of us, that is, the *Reſtipu-*
'*lation of a good Conſcience towards God by the*
'*Reſurrection*

'*Resurrection of Christ from the Dead*, in order 'unto his own Glory, and our *full Enjoyment* 'of all the Benefits of it, it is Unquestionably 'true. But, if it be intended, that they are '*such* a *Condition* of the Covenant, as to be by 'us perform'd antecedently unto the Partici-'pation of any Grace, Mercy, or Priviledge of 'it, so as that they should be the Considera-'tion, and Procuring Causes of them; that 'they should be all of them, as some speak, 'the *Reward of our Faith, and Obedience*, it is 'most *false*, and not only contrary to expres 'Testimonies of Scripture; but Destructive of 'the Nature of the Covenant it self. If it be 'intended, that these things, tho' promised in 'the Covenant, and wrought in by the Grace 'of God, are yet Duties Required of us in 'order unto the Participation and Enjoyment 'of the *full End* of the Covenant in Glory, 'it is the *Truth*, which is asserted. But if it 'be said that *Faith*, and *New Obedience*, that is, '*Works of Righteousness, which we do*, are so the '*Condition* of the Covenant, as that whatever 'the one is ordained of God as the means of, 'and in order to such or such an End, as *Justi-'fication*, that the other is likewise ordained 'unto the same End, with the same kind of 'Efficiency, or with the same Respect unto 'the Effect, it is expressly contrary to the whole 'Scope, and Expres Design of the Apostle on 'that Subject. *Dr. O. Of Justific.*

But, notwithstanding the various senses the word [Condition] is Capable of; and how mischievous soever the *Popish*, *Arminian* and *Socinian* Usages of it are; there is a Sound Sense

Sense in which the Word may be used.

Relativa Quis, Qui, Quæ, Quod Juncta verbo futuri temporis faciunt suum Antecedens Conditionale. Ot. Phil. Zepper. Cynos. Legal.

That Faith is a Condition (if we may in our Interpreting of Scripture, observe the Rules of the *Juncts*) is as certain, as if it had been expressly mention'd in the Holy Scriptures. These words [*He that believes shall be saved*] Import a *Condition*. For, *Relativum junctum Verbo futuri temporis conditionem facit:* which, our Modern Divines, who Reject the above-mentioned Errors, do yet approve; but in what *Sense*, is our Business at this time to Explain.

Condition then may be Distributed into Legall, and Gospel, or *Testamentary*. A Legall *Condition* is *Obedience to the Preceptive Part of a Law, giving Right to the Reward*; such was that of the Covenant of Works made with *Adam*; and of this sort are the *Popish*, *Arminian*, and *Socinian Conditions*. A Gospel Condition is of the same Kind with what Peculiarly belongs to *Testamentary Dispositions*. It is, (say the *Civilians*) *Lex Negotio apposita, unde Ipsius Eventus pendet*. Or, *Lex addita negotio quæ donec præstetur suspendit Eventum*. 'Which, (says 'Dr. *Owen*) signifies such things, as are added 'to the Principal Cause, whereon its Operation is suspended. As a man bequeaths an '*Hundred Pound* unto another, on *Condition*, that 'he come, or go to such a Place, and Demand 'it. This is no *Valuable Consideration*, yet is 'the Effect of the Principal Cause, or the Will 'of the *Testator* suspended thereupon.

To understand this *Testamentary Condition*, we must consider that there is a *Principal* Cause, whose Operation is *suspended*, till a *Rule*, added thereunto, be observed. There is the Promise,

or

or Donation of a Legacy, which must be given according to the last Will of the *Testator*. But to this *Promise*, or *Donation*, there is added a *Rule*, that must be Regarded, *viz.* That this Legacy be given either in such a time or Place, or in such a way, or manner. This is the *Lex additus Negotio* that must be observed before the Legacy be actually given. It is the *Condition*, which, till Perform'd, suspends the Event; namely, the giving of the Legacy. And (as the Learned Mr. *Baxter* explains it) 'tis only the *Modus Promissionis Donationis, vel Contractus*; where, the fulfilling of the Promise, is as Really suspended until this *Modus* be observed, as if it had Resulted from the Observation of it. A Disposition made on Condition, or *sub modo*, signifieth nothing until the Condition or Mode be perform'd. Tho' it hath no *Causality* in Producing the *Effect*; yet, 'is the *Effect*, as Really suspended thereby, as if it had. Thus it has Pleased the *Testator* to dispose, and his Disposition none can disannul.

Cath. Theol. lib. 2. p. 248.

Dispositio enim facta sub Conditione vel modo nihil valet, nisi Conditio & Modus adimpleatur.

Nunquam enim actio in Effectu competit nisi prius oblatâ & præstitâ Cautione de modo adimplendo, quia alias locum habet Exceptio doli --- Modo deficiente extinguatur debitum perinde ac si deficeret Conditio: Ot. Phil. Zepper. Cynos. Legal.

In this sense, seeing Justification is Promised, in the *Last Will*, and Testament of our Lord Jesus, to *Him, that Believeth*, Faith is the *Modus Promissionis*, vel *Donationis*. So that altho' Justification be not the *Result* of our Faith, but of Christ's Righteousness alone; yet Faith being made by the Testator, a *Modus* of the Disposition or Donation, there can be no Justification without it. The Operation of Christ's Righteousness, which in this Case, is the *Negotium*, or Principal

Principal Cause of our Justification, is by the Non-Performance of Faith suspended, and so long we remain *Unjustified*.

It hath pleased God to fix such an Order in the Dispensation of his Blessings, that the one necessarily antecedes the other, and what goeth before another hath an Influence upon that other, as it is *so* setled, and establish'd by the Ordinance of God. Not that the former gives *Right* unto the latter; but so it is appointed of God, that such an Order be observed in the disposing of these Blessings, that he who has not the first, shall not have the second; He that hath not Faith shall not be Justified.

But whether it be a *Condition* of the *Covenant of Grace*; Or, a Condition in this Covenant; Or only a Condition of our Justification, tho' our Divines have different Sentiments about it, yet 'tis generally held, that Faith is a *Condition* of *Justification*. They that scruple the use of the Word, own the thing signified thereby.

The Learned Author of *Anti-Sozzo* saith, that Faith is a Condition *in* the Covenant of Grace, tho' not *of* it, and they, who hold, that the Covenant of Grace was made with Christ as a *Second Adam*, do assert, that it is also made with the Faithful, the *Members* of Christ, for which the Judicious Mr. *Strong* gives several Reasons; namely, 'That the Saints may 'see that they are as strictly *bound to Obedience* 'in their own Persons under the *Second Cove-* 'nant, as they were, under the *First*. And that 'the Doctrine of the Gospel, tho' it be a Doc- 'trine of *Liberty*, is not a Doctrine of *Licen-* 'tiousness; and that they may stand in awe of the 'Threats

Discourse of the two Covenants, *lib.* 3. *c.* 3. *p.* 162.

'*Threats* of God. This Doctrine (saith he) I 'do the rather pitch upon in Opposition to the '*Licentious Tenent* of the *Antinomians*, who say, 'that all is Required of Christ, and nothing 'of Us.

This Notion of a *Condition*, as it doth most fully Provide against *Antinomianism*, by Inferring the Necessity of Faith's being in Order of Nature before Justification; so, it doth as effectually secure us from the *Popish*, *Arminian*, and *Socinian* Rocks, in that it is not a Legal, but a Testamentary *Condition*, that cannot Establish the *Merit* of Good Works, nor Interfere with Christ's *meriting*, or the Spirits working the First Grace; nor Subvert the Doctrine of *Satisfaction*, or Particular Election. All Testamentary Dispositions, whatever be the *Modes* of Donation, are of Free Grace, not of Debt, and being Given to us, as the Children of a *Testator*, the Merit and Gift of the First Grace, which is necessary to our being such Children, cannot be Destroyed by such a *Modus*, or Condition.

These things will Appear with much more Clearness if we consider, that the Holy Scriptures Represent Christ as a *Second-Adam*; the Father of a *Spiritual Off-spring*.

Two things Christ did, as a *Second-Adam*. He undertook to *beget* a *Seed*, and Raise that *Seed* unto Glory. This Seed Christ Purchased, and on his Purchase they are given him by the Father according to the terms Agreed on between the Father, and the Son in the Eternal Compact.

That Christ begets a Seed, and by his Word and Spirit Governs, and Raises them unto Glory

Glory, is so far from being inconsistent with his *Meriting*, and *Giving* the *First* Grace, that it is in Pursuance of it. Christ merited a Seed; and, that he may have what he merited, a *Seed* is Given him; which is by the *Fathers drawing*, the *Sons gathering*, and the *Spirits working Grace in them*.

Christ also, as a *Second-Adam*, made satisfaction for his Children; who, as soon as they do spiritually by Regeneration Descend from him, have a Right to Impunity. If the Satisfaction had been made by Christ, as a Mediator *for the Elect*, *as such*, then indeed, as soon as they had any Being, they would have been Discharg'd from the Debt. But Christ making Satisfaction for the Elect as *his Seed*, they cannot partake of the Right resulting from it, but as they become his Seed. As they are his Seed *Virtually*, they have a *Virtual* Discharge; but an *Actual* Discharge, they cannot have, till they are *Actually* born again.

Moreover, the *Covenant of Grace* being made with Christ, as a *Second-Adam*, the *Promises* are made unto Christ, as the Reward of his Obedience, but *for his Seed*; so that in Christ you must be by Faith, that you may be Pardoned, and Saved; and yet your Pardon and Salvation Results not from your *Faith*; but from *Christ's Righteousness*: whereby, it's manifest, that Gospel-Promises are Powerful Motives to Engage us to do our utmost to Believe and Repent, and must be Preached to this Very-End, and Purpose.

Thus the Doctrine of our *Merit* is laid by, Christ's meriting and working the First Grace, and

and his making Satisfaction to God's Justice, and the necessity of our Faith, Repentance and Sanctification are abundantly cleared by this Gospel-Representation, that is made of Christ, as he is a *Second Adam*, with whom the Covenant of Grace is made, and with his *Seed*, as *such*, which is so far from destroying *Particular Election*, that it establisheth it. For the *Elect* were Promised unto Christ, merited by him, and given unto him, as the Reward of his Sufferings, whereby it is made *sure*; that the Death of Christ shall not be altogether in vain. He shall see the *Elect* as the Travel of his Soul, and be satisfied.

Thus as in Opposition to *Popery*, *Arminianism*, and *Socinianism*, *Legal Conditions* are Justly Rejected; so in Contradiction to the *Antinomian Error* Testamentary Conditions are here explicated and asserted.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

The Notion the first Reformers *had of Justifying Faith, not* Antinomian. *Their Doctrine in Opposition to the* Papist, Arminian, *and* Socinian *Described. That they did not hold Justification to be before Faith; Nor did they Exclude all* Doubtings *from Faith; nor hold that we might live, as we list, and whilst so, Believe, and be Justified.*

To Assert, [*That* Faith *is a Certain, and Full* Perswasion *wrought in the Heart of Man, through the Holy Ghost, whereby he is* Assured *of the Mercy of God, Promised in Christ,* that his Sins are Forgiven him] is not *Antinomianism.*

THE *Antinomians,* (I mean such as are really so) have had too much Honour given them by such as Grant, that their Notion about *Faith* is supported by the Suffrage of the *First Reformers:* Whereas, on a Diligent search, 'twill Appear, that the Difference between them is very great; the *Antinomians* holding Actual Justification in the Sight of God to be before Faith, and the *Others* Deny it.

To Vindicate the First *Reformers* from this Unjust Charge, I will impartially propose what they held of it, and show, how they have opposed

posed the *Papists*, *Arminians*, and *Socinians*, and wherein they differ from the *Antinomians*.

The Account they give of Faith is the same with what I have laid down; they make it to be a Firm Perswasion, wrought in the Heart of Man, that his Sins are forgiven him.

Luther defines it thus. 'Faith is a Firm, and 'Certain Knowledge, or Perswa-'sion, that God is propitious 'through Jesus Christ; and that 'through him, he hath thoughts 'of Peace, and not of Wrath con-'cerning us.

Fides est firma, & certa cogitatio, seu fiducia *de Deo, quod per Christum sit Propitius, quod per Christum Cogitet de nobis Cogitationes pacis, non iræ. Luth. in Gen.* c. 15.

Melanchton, in the First Part of his Works, saith, 'That Faith is, not only a Knowledge 'of the Scripture History, but a '*Persuasion of the Mercy of God* '*Promised in and through his* Son.-- 'That the Knowledge of the 'History would terrifie, and 'frighten us, unless we fix it 'in our Souls, That Christ is our 'Propitiator, who will lead us 'to the Father. To clear thus 'much, he assures us, he could 'Produce Authorities Innumera-ble. And, amongst many others insists on the Testimony of * St. *Bernard*, 'who 'affirms it to be necessary in the first Place to 'believe that the Remission of Sins is to be had 'only through the Mercy and Grace of God, 'and *then* to *Believe*, that the Pardon *of Sin* is 'Given to Thee; *Melanchton* also adds, That 'to Place Faith in a *Fiducia*, a Perswasion, or 'Confidence of the Mercy of God in Christ,

Fides significat non tantum Historiæ notitiam; sed FIDUCIAM *misericordiæ Promissæ propter filium Dei.*

*--*Addam & Bernardi Testimonium* —— *Necesse est primo omnium credere quod Remissionem Peccatorum habent possis nisi per Indulgentiam Dei, sed adde ut Credas & hoc quod per ipsum Peccata Te* TIBI *donantur. Melanch. Oper. Pac.* 1.

'is, according to the ſenſe of the Reformed 'Churches; That the firſt and chief Object 'of Faith is God Reconciled according to the 'Promiſe; or the Promiſe of Reconcilia-'tion. That *Paul* takes *Faith* to be *that*, 'by which we ſo Embrace the Promiſe, 'as to Believe, our Sins in Particular are for-'given, and that we are Reconciled.

Melanct. Oper. Pars 2.

Calvin in his Inſtitutions makes Faith to be a *Certain*, and *Firm Knowledge of the Mercy of God towards* Us, *Founded on the Truth of the Free Promiſe in Chriſt, made* known, *and ſealed to our Hearts by the Holy Spirit.* And his *Catechiſm*, Tranſlated into *Engliſh*, and Joyned to the *Form of Prayers*, &c. uſed in the *Engliſh* Congregation at *Geneva*, in Queen *Maries* Reign, hath it thus: 'Faith is 'a *ſure Perſwaſion*, and a ſtedfaſt Knowledge 'of God's Tender Love *towards* Us, according 'as he hath plainly uttered in his Goſpel, 'that he will be both a Father, and a Sa-'viour unto Us, through the Means of Je-'ſus Chriſt.

Nunc Jacta Fidei Definitio nobis conſtabit, ſi dicamus eſſe Divinæ erga nos Benevolentiæ firmam certamq; Cognitionem, &c. Inſtit. lib. 3. c. 2. §. 7.

Queſt. & Reſp. *Beza* thus. 'That we may Diſtinguiſh the 'Children of Light from the Children of Dark-'neſs, we muſt not make Faith to lye *only* in 'that Knowledge, which is Common to us, and 'the Devils; whereby we know all thoſe 'Things to be *True*, which are contained in 'the Writings of the Prophets and Apoſtles: 'But moreover, in a *Firm Aſſent of the Mind*, 'whereby we do in a very Peculiar manner ſo 'Apply the Promiſe of Eternal Life, as if it 'had

'had been *Actually fulfilled.* More fully, in his *Annotations on* Rom. 1. 16. 'Faith is that cer-'tain and full Assurance, by which 'he, that believes, is perswaded, 'not only, that the Word of God 'in General, and more especially, 'the Promises of Reconciliation 'through Christ are firm and 'sure; but that *these Promises*, in 'the Ministry of the Word, and 'Sacraments, *offer'd* unto him, do 'properly, and in a peculiar man-'ner belong unto him. *Faith* is 'that, by which the Promise of Eternal Life, 'Purchased by the Blood of Christ for every 'one that Believeth, is particularly embraced 'and *applied to ones self.*

Fidem esse definimus firmam illam & constantem, animi πληροφορίαν, id est, certam rationem, quod certus ipse apud se unusquisq; fidelium --- Promissiones Dei de Gratuitâ per Christum Reconciliatione --- sed etiam istas per prædicationem & Sacramenta sibi oblatas CREDIT AD SE PROPRIE, *ac* PECULIARITER *pertinere.* Bez. *in* Rom. 1. 16.

Peter Martyr, tho' he Defines not Faith thus, yet holds, 'That every saving Believer is Per-'swaded, he is by Adoption the Child of God, 'and chosen to Eternal Life. In like manner, *Zanchy*, affirms, 'That he is not a sound Be-'liever who is not with a strong Confidence 'perswaded, that God is a propitious, and 'merciful Father unto him. —— Nor can he 'be esteemed to hope in God aright, who 'doth not Confidently believe he is an Heir 'of the Heavenly Kingdom.

Loc Com. Class. 3. c. 3. § 10.

Tom. 8. Loc. 7. De fid. p. 713.

But *Paraus*, on the *Romans* saith, 'That 'Faith is not only a General Assent to the Do-'ctrine of the Gospel; but a certain Knowledge, 'Assent, and Belief of the Gospel Promise con-'cerning the Blessings procured by Christ for 'every Believer; and therefore as belonging to '*me* in *Particular.* Or, It is a Certain and

'Firm Assent unto the Doctrine of Christ, 'with a full Perswasion of the free Pardon 'of our Sins, and Eternal Life through Jesus 'Christ.

Paræus in Rom. 3. 21.

Hemingius is of the same Mind. And, who ever will, may see, in Le Blank, many others, making Faith to lye in a Firm Perswasion, that our Sins are Forgiven.

Hemin. Opusc. in his Enchir. Theol. Clas. 1. c. 12.

Dr. *Willet* affirms it to have been held by Blessed Martyrs in *Henry* the Eighth, and Queen *Mary*'s Reigns, and by the later *Helvetian*, *Saxony*, and *Bohemian* Confessions: And, sure I am, that it is very Express in our *Book of Homilies*, established by Act of *Parliament*.

Thes. Theol. de Fid. Justif. Nat. Synop. Papis. Contr. 19. Part 2. Quæst. 2.

This Notion of Justifying Faith, the *Lutheran*, and *Calvinian* Reformers insisted very much upon, in their Opposition unto the Papists, who held Faith to be but an *Historical* Assent: And yet, it must be acknowledged that *Cassander* offers some Considerations of great weight to Prove, that the *Generality* of the most Learned in the Church of *Rome* agreed with the Reformed herein, blaming us for insinuating, as if they taught the People to doubt of the Grace of God, and of their Salvation, and then make it a Reason of the Separation.

Consult. Art. 4.

Non recte Protestantes Ecclesiam præsentem incusant, quod doceat & jubeat, de gratia Dei, & vita Æterna dubitare, atq; hanc blasphemam (ut aiunt) Doctrinam, inter præcipuas Causas ponunt, cur ab ea Discedendum sibi putent.

'In the *Enchiridion* of *Christian* '*Religion*, Published by the *Provincial Council* at '*Cologne*, A. D. 1536. it is (saith *Cassander*) 'expresly granted, That to our Justification it's 'Required, not only to believe in general, that 'Sins are forgiven all, that Repent; but that

'my

'my sins in Particular through Christ by Faith 'are forgiven me. That this very Explication 'of Faith is in the *Emperor's Book*, drawn up at 'Ratisbone, and Approv'd; where 'tis thus. 'It is sound Doctrine to hold, that a Sinner is 'Justified by a lively Efficacious Faith. By a 'Lively Faith, we mean, a Mo- 'tion of the Holy Ghost, where- 'by they, who Repent of their 'past Life, are turn'd towards 'God, and do truly apprehend 'the Grace Promised in Christ; 'so as that they do *Really perceive*, 'they *have Obtain'd the* Pardon 'of their Sins, and *Reconcilia- 'tion through the Merit of Christ.*

Firma & sana Doctrina est, per fidem vivam & efficacem Justificari peccatorem, Vocamus autem fidem vivam, motum Spiritus Sancti, quo vere pœnitentes veteris vitæ, eriguntur ad Deum, & verè apprehendunt misericordiam in Christo promissam, ut jam verè sentiant quod Remissionem Peccatorum, & Reconciliationem propter meritum Christi, gratuita Dei benitate acceperunt, &c. Cassand. Consult. Art. 4.

However, *Alfonsus de Castro* will have it, that not many of their Church were of this Opinion, that the *Enchiridion* of *Christian Religion* was not much to be regarded, because *Hermannus*, the Archbishop of *Cologne*, who called the Provincial Council, by which 'twas Published, was an *Heretick*; But, *Binius*, in the Title, prefixed to this Council, saith, 'twas *after* this that the Archbishop fell into Heresie: And yet nevertheless, it must be yielded, That 'twas greatly Controverted between *Papist* and *Protestant*, Whether Faith was a *Fiducia*, and lay in a firm Perswasion of our being Pardoned; Or, only a General Assent?

Consilium Coloniense Provinciale Auctoritate Hermanni Archiepiscopi (qui POSTEA in Hæresin lapsus est) pro Reformatione, &c.

And as the Reformed Defended this Notion about Faith in Opposition to the *Papists*; so they did it also against the *Arminian*, and *Socinian*.

Bodechers. Socin. Rem. c. 11. p. 79, 80.

Bodechersus, in his *Sociniano-Remonstrantismus*, doth out of the Remonstrants Confession and Writings of *Socinus* shew an Agreement between the *Socinian*, and *Arminian*, in their Denying this *Fiducia*, or Perswasion to be Saving Faith.

Johannes Peltius in his Harmony, out of *Arminius*; *Episcopius*; *Arnoldus*; the *Remonstrants Conference*, at the *Hague*; their *Confession*, and *Apology*, &c. as also out of *Ostorodius*, and *Socinus* puts it out of all Doubt, that the *Arminians* and *Socinians* concur in their oppugning Faiths being such a firm Perswasion: And out of the *Belgick Confession*, and *Catechism*, and the *National Synod* at *Dort*, He makes it manifest, that the Reformed held Faith to be a Perswasion that our Sins are Pardoned.

Polyander, *Rivet*, *Walæus*, and *Thysius* in their *Censure* of the *Remonstrants Confession*, having shown the Parallel between the *Arminians*, and 'Socinians, are Positive, that the 'very Hinge of the Controversie 'between them, and the Refor-'med Churches Turn on this 'Point. That Saving Faith is a '*Fiducia*, or full Perswasion the '*Socinians* themselves, (as these 'Great men Expres it) do Con-'fess; But the Enquiry is, What 'is the *Proper Object* of this *Fidu-'cia*, or Perswasion? Whether 'it *be the* Special Mercy *of God*, 'through the Merit of Christ, which he, who Be-'lieves, doth by *this* Fiducia, *Apply unto him-'self?* or, what? To this, these Authors of the

Nobiscum Remonstrantes consentiunt, quod fides salvifica FIDUCIA, *dicatur. & sit, quam etiam* Sociniani, *ut videmus*, VERAM FIDUCIAM *esse dicunt. Sed in qua talis* Fiducia *constitat, & quodnam sit ejus Objectum* proprium, in eo totius Controversiæ, *quam nunc* omnibus Ecclesiis Reformatis *movent*, *vertitur* CARDO. *Cens.* c. 11. p. 158.

the Censure, in Opposition unto the *Papist*, *Arminian*, and *Socinian*, do give it as the sense of the Reformed, that the *Remission of Sin*, *de præsenti*, is the Proper Object of this *Fiducia*, or Perswasion, and that Justifying Faith lyeth in such a Perswasion, as that by which we Believe, our Sins in *præsenti* are Forgiven us.

Against this Doctrine *Bellarmine*, *Socinus*, and the *Remonstrants* raise several Objections, Exposing the Notion, and all that Defended it to the utmost Reproach, and Contempt, as if hereby the *Pardon of Sin was made a Necessary Antecedent unto Justifying Faith*, and none could have Faith but they, who had a Comfortable Assurance, and that whoever could but Confidently Perswade himself his Sins were Pardoned, how wickedly soever he lived, had Saving Faith, and was Justified. Besides, amongst Protestants themselves, there have been of late years too many, who not searching diligently enough into the *Writings* of the First Reformers, have too hastily condemn'd them, and given too much Countenance to the Unrighteous Accusations of *Papists*, *Arminians*, and *Socinians*, and Encouraged the *Antinomians* to go on the more boldly in their Error, as if they had *Luther*, *Calvin*, and all their Followers to Abet it; whereas, on a fair and equal Tryal, these Charges will appear to be Groundless, and Unreasonable, which with much clearness may be evinced, if we consider, How the First Reformers held, That Justification is not before Faith. That many Fears, and Doubtings are consistent with it. And, That none, who continued to live under the Reigning

Power of their Lusts had; or, *whilst so*, could *have Saving Faith.*

These things, for the Readers greater Satisfaction; I will, with all the Plainness I can, particularly Prove.

To the First, That Justification is not before Faith.

1. Thus much necessarily flows from their Asserting Faith to be the *Instrumental* Cause of Justification. If Faith be a *Cause*, tho' but a less Principal One of Justification; Justification can't be before it. 'Twould be the Greatest Injustice Imaginable, to Insinuate, that the first Reformers, affirmed, That Justification was before Faith, and yet Faith any Cause of Justification. They could not be so grosly Ignorant as to think the Effect had an Existence before its Cause.

That they insisted on Faiths being the *Instrumental* Cause of Justification is so much the Burden of their Writings, that whoever consults them, can't find room for the Least Doubt concerning it. Our Learned *Wotton* instances in *Calvin*, *Ursin*, *Hannius*, *Bastingius*, *Chemnitius*, *Bucanus*, *Willet*, and *Perkins*, as Asserters of it, And he might have added *Paræus*, *Beza*, *Peter Martyr*, *Zanchy*, and many others.

De Reconcil. Par. 1. lib. 2. c. 11.

Quenstedius, a *Lutheran*, mentions *Gerhardus*, *Battus*, *Dorscheus*, *Kesler*, the *Theologi Giessenses*, *Hulsemannus*, *Calovius*, and *Dannhaverus*, as Men of Great Learning, who made Faith to lye in a firm Perswasion of the Pardon of Sin, and yet Affirm'd it to be the *Instrumental Cause* of Justification. But,

Theol. Didact. Polem. Par. 3. c. 8. § 2. q. 6.

2. This

2. This will appear with more Conviction on an Equal Proposal of what the Reformers themselves have Deliver'd in Explicating the Notion, they had of *Justifying Faith*, whose Disquisitions, for the Investigation of Truth, were very Close and Profound: They weighed the Difficulties on every hand, and their Determinations were after much Consideration, and with Great Judgment.

But this thing having been already done by the Learned *Le Blank*, I must beseech my Reader to have Recourse unto him; And yet, for the help of such as have him not, I will out of him, and some other Judicious Writers on this Subject, give the sense of the Reformed.

The Learned *Robert Baronius*, in *Le Blank*, Explicates the Notion about *Fiducia*, thus: 'First, The Object of this Perswasion is not '(saith he) only the Pardon of 'Sin *to be Impetrated*, and had; 'but also as *already* obtain'd. 'Secondly, That this *Perswasion* 'respects these *two Objects* by 'two *Distinct Acts*: The *one* of 'which goeth before Justifica-'tion, as its *Instrumental Cause*: 'The *other* followeth it, as its 'Effect, and *Consequent*. Third-'ly, The *Fiducial Act*, which 'Precedes Justification, as its 'Cause, is a *Perswasion* of the 'Satisfaction of Christ for us in 'Particular, and of the Remis-'sion of Sins to be obtain'd 'by and for his Satisfaction.

De objecto igitur fidei salvificæ hæc tenenda sunt. Primo tenendum est, Objectum fiduciæ non solum esse Remissionem peccatorum impetrandam, & obtinendam, sed etiam earum Remissionem jam Impetratam. *Secundo, Fiduciam in hæc duo tendere per duos distinctos actus, quorum alter præcedit Justificationem, ut ejus causa Instrumentalis; alter eam sequitur, ut ejus effectum, & Consequens. Tertio, actum fiducialem, qui Justificationem præcedit, ut ejus causa, esse persuasionem de Christi satisfactione* pro nobis in particulari, *& de remissione peccatorum obtinenda per & propter ejus satisfactionem.*

Fourthly,

Quarto, Actum fiducialem, *qui Justificationem sequitur, esse Persuasionem de remissione Peccatorum jam Impetratæ, & de nostrâ Perseverantiâ in eo statu, usq; ad finem vitæ. Baronius in Le Blanc. Thes. de fid. Justif. Nat.* § LXII.

'*Fourthly*, This *Fiducial Act*, 'which followeth Justification, 'is a Persuasion of the Re-'mission of Sins *already* Impe-'trated, and of our Perseve-'rance in that state to the end 'of our Lives.

Maresius, saith, That there is a Threefold Act of Faith, distinctly to be Considered in our Justification. The *first Dispositive*, whereby I believe, that Christ hath merited the Pardon of Sin for *them*, that are his, *&c.* The *Second* is *formally Justificatory*, whereby I, who am now Sorrowing for my Sin, and Purposing Amendment of Life do believe, that all my Sins are at this present Forgiven: The *Third Consolatory* whereby I Believe, that all my Sins *have been Pardoned*, and that I shall never more be in a State of Condemnation. In the *First* sense, Faith is *before* Justification. In the *Second*, *Simultaneous* with it; In the *Third*, it followeth it. *Paræus* expresseth himself to the same purpose. Before the *Act* of Justification, (that is to say, in order of Nature, not of time) Our *Faith* or Persuasion hath for its Object this Proposition, *de futuro*, [*My Sins* shall be *Forgiven me on my* believing.] In the very *Act* of Justification, it hath this Proposition *de præsenti*, [*My Sins are Forgiven me*;] *After* my Justification, *this* de *Præterito*. [My Sins *have already been* Pardoned.]

The

The Authors of the *Censure*, do on this occasion declare, 'That 'the Remonstrants *Fight against* 'their own Shadow, *against a Chi-* 'mæra of their own feigning, when 'they insinuate, as if we held, 'that *our Sins were efficaciously blot-* 'ted out before we believe; and 'that *then* we are Justified when 'we Believe, that they are blotted out. From 'which absurd Opinion 'twould follow, that 'the Remission of Sin was neither the whole, 'nor a part of our Justification; but, that our 'Justification was somewhat *after* it. Which 'cannot be allowed, unless Justification be 'taken for the Sense *of Justification* in our 'selves; or for a *Manifestation*, or Declaration 'of it unto others. We do not therefore say, 'That that Perswasion, by which we are Justi- 'fied, is of the Remission of Sins *already had*; 'Or, that the Object of this Perswasion is the 'Pardon of Sin before obtained: But that *Per-* 'swasion, by which we all believe our Sins to 'be in *præsenti* forgiven us, not properly in 'præterito, or in *futuro*, altho' both belong to 'Justifying Faith, yet not to the *formal* Act of 'Justification, as we usually Express it. Where- 'fore when the Mercy of God and the Pardon 'of Sin is offer'd to us in the Gospel through 'Christ, we are not only in the *General* Per- 'swaded, that all, who believe, shall have their 'Sins forgiven them: But, he that savingly 'believes, doth firmly perswade himself, that 'the *Promise of Pardon doth belong to him*, and 'is received by that very Act of Faith, and ac- 'cordingly

Omnes autem isti [*viz.* Bellarmitus, Socinus, & Remonstrantes] *adversus Umbram suam pugnant, & contra Chimæram, quam sibi confixerunt, tela sua, dirigunt; supponentes nos statuere peccata nostra quoad efficaciam, deleri, priusquam credamus, &c. Cens. Conf. Rem.* c. 11. p. 159.

'cordingly then his Sin is forgiven him; and 'that Bleſſedneſs ſpoken of in *Rom.* 6. 7. made 'his---Thus the Remiſſion of Sin, and a Per-'ſwaſion of that Remiſſion are in a Saving Be-'liever at the *ſame time*; But he, who is Per-'ſwaded, that if he believes, he ſhall be Juſti-'fied, is not therefore as yet *Juſtified*, Unleſs 'he doth Actually and in *præſenti* believe, That 'that Righteouſneſs is given him, which he 'Receives with the ſame Act of Faith. What 'he afterwards believes *de præterito* doth not 'Juſtifie him, but ſuppoſes him to be already 'Juſtified. All theſe Acts are of one and the 'ſame Juſtifying Faith. The *Firſt Diſpoſes* for 'Juſtification: The *Second Properly Juſtifieth*: 'The *Third Quiets Conſcience* according to that 'in *Rom.* 5. 1, 2.

'From what hath been here ſaid, it's appa-'rent, that there is no force at all in this *Soci-'nian*, and *Arminian* Objection againſt *us*, for 'they oppoſe us, as if we aſſign'd to Juſtifying 'Faith one only ſingle Act, whereas nothing 'can be more manifeſt than that we make them '*three Diſtinct Acts*; whence, it's eaſie enough 'to Conceive, how Juſtifying Faith is a Perſwa-'ſion of the ſpecial Mercy of God to be, *de* '*futuro*, obtain'd; and which in *præſenti*, by the 'very *Act* of Believing, is Perceiv'd.

'This *Fiducia*, or Perſwaſion, as Deſcribed 'by the *Remonſtrants* to be a firm Belief, that 'it's not poſſible for any to eſcape Eternal 'Death, and attain to Everlaſting Life, any 'other way than by Jeſus Chriſt, and as he 'hath Preſcribed; is not a *Juſtifying*; it is but 'an *Hiſtorical*, or *Dogmatick* Faith. It only re-

'ſpects

'spects what is *Future*, not what is *Past*, or Pre-
'sent; nor doth it beget in the Minds of Be-
'lievers any thing certain of the Impetration
'of Salvation; but only of its *Possibility*, *Manner*,
'and *Reason*, &c. So far the *Censure* of the *Re-*
'*monstrants Confession*.

Censur. Confis. Rem. c.11.p.158, 159, &c.

By what I have here gather'd out of *Le Blank*, and some others, it's manifest, That tho' the Reformed took into the *Description* they gave of Justifying Faith, the *Perswasion* of *the Pardon* of *Sin*, yet Generally they Agreed in Denying Justification to be *before it*. The Methods they took for the clearing thus much, you see, were divers.

Zanchy, following the Excellent *Martin Bucer*, held Faith, and *Fiducia* to be Inseparably conjoyn'd, but yet the one different from the other. *Beza* and *Garisiolius* took this *Fiducia* or Firm Perswasion to be an Inseparable Effect of Faith. And, they, who made it the the Formal Reason and the Justifying Act, considered the *Objects* of this Perswasion distinctly, as the Pardon was either *Future*, *de præsenti*, or *de præterito*: As it was a Pardon that either *should be*; Or, as then actually had; Or, as what had been before: and so made the Perswasion of a Pardon to be had, *Antecedaneous* to Justification; But as *de præsenti* obtained, *Simultaneous* with it; And the other *after* it, That tho' they Defined it by Perswasion of a Pardon *already* had; yet made it not the Justifying Act. The utmost Point, to which they went, was, That this *Fiducia*, or Particular Perswasion of Forgiveness *de præsenti*, was *Simultaneous*, and in the same Instant of Nature with Justification, which

Bucerus in lib. de Reconcil. Ecclesiarum in Artic. de Justific. multis Demonstrat fidem a fiducia differre: quamquam semper sint ambæ inseparabiliter Conjunctæ Zanch. Oper. Tom. 7. de Perfever. Sanctor. p. 354.

which is a Motion contrary unto, and destructive of the *Antinomian* Error, as hereby it's made impossible for an Elect Person to be actually justified in the sight of God one Instant of Nature before he be by Faith United unto Christ, that every such person, so long as he is in a state of Unbelief and Unregeneracy, is unjustified, is in a state of Condemnation, and under the *Curse* of the Law.

This particular is very clearly expressed by the Learned Dr. *Ames*, who saith, 'That this Justifying Faith doth, 'of its own Nature, beget, and 'therefore hath conjoyn'd with it 'a *special*, and *sure Perswasion* of 'the Grace and Mercy of God in 'Christ; whence it is oft described 'by the *Orthodox* to be such a Perswasion, especially, when they oppugn that *General Faith*, to 'which the *Papists* ascribe every 'thing. Or, as *Le Blank* hath it. 'If any enquire, why they define 'Justifying Faith by an Act that 'doth not really justifie, but follows Justification, rather than by 'an *Act*, by which we are justified? It seems very evident, they 'were induced thereunto by these 'considerations; namely, That 'this last Act præsupposes the 'former, and doth more clearly 'explicate the entire nature of 'Faith, and contribute more to the comfort of 'Believers. In a word; this Assurance of the 'pardon

Fides ista Justificans suâ Naturâ producit, atque adeo conjunctam secum habet specialem ac certam persuasionem, de gratia ac miserecordia Dei in Christo: unde etiam per istam persuasionem Fides justificans non malè sæpe describitur ab Orthodoxis, præsertim cum impugnant generalem illam Fidem, qui omnia tribuunt Pontificii. Ame. Medul. l. 7. c. 27. § 19.

Sed siquis jam quærat, cur eandem Justificantem definiunt ab Actu, qui revera non justificat, sed sequitur jam factam Justificationem potius quam ab illo, quo revera justificamur, ad illud eo videntur inducti, quod actus iste posterior præcedentem supponat, & clarius Fidei perfectionem explicet, & ad consolationem fidelium maxime faciat, &c. Thes. de Fid. Just. nat. § 68.

'pardon of ſin was the more inſiſted on by the 'Reformers, becauſe ſo much oppoſed by the 'Papiſts, with whom the Controverſie then 'moſtly was. So far *Le Blank.*

To give a more particular Account of the the Leſſer Differences among the Firſt Reformers, as well as among our Modern Divines, and ſhow how they variouſly explicated the Doctrine of Juſtification by Faith, being more to gratifie the *Curioſity* of ſome, than ſatisfie the Conſciences of any, I will wave it, and go on to

The ſecond; That many *Fears and Doubts are conſiſtent with Juſtifying Faith.*

Tho' they made Juſtifying Faith to be a firm perſwaſion of the pardon of ſin, yet they meant not ſuch a perſwaſion as was ſo excluſive of all Doubts and Fears about our Salvation, that whoever in the leaſt doubted, was deſtitute of Faith.

'This *Perſwaſion* (ſaith Dr. *Amés*) as to the '*ſenſe* of it, doth not always accompany Faith: 'For, it may be, and often is, either through 'the weakneſs of Judgment, or by reaſon of 'many Temptations and Troubles of Spirit, 'that he, who ſavingly believes, and is by Faith 'juſtified in the ſight of God, may, for a time, 'judging of himſelf by what he *feels*, conclude 'that he neither ſavingly believes, nor is re-'conciled to God.

Thus much the Dr. adds immediately after he had told us, that many who were Orthodox deſcribed Faith by a perſwaſion of the Grace and Mercy of God in Chriſt, whereby he ſeems to inſinuate a diſtinction to be between the

Perſwaſion

Perſwaſion of Pardon, and the ſenſe of that Perſwaſion; as if they who had not the ſenſe of it might yet have the perſwaſion. And it muſt be granted, that there is ſomewhat of this nature obvious to the Experience of thoſe Divines, who are moſt converſant with troubled Conſciences. For, it is commonly obſerved by them, that godly perſons, even when under the Horror of Deſpair, crying out, *They ſhall be damned*; if asked, whether they will part with what Intereſt they have in Chriſt, will anſwer, they'll not do it for a World; which intimates, as if they had a ſecret perſwaſion of pardon, tho' they wanted a *ſenſe* of it; which the firſt Reformers explained by diſtinguiſhing between the *Habit*, and *Act* of Saving Faith. 'True Juſtifying Faith (ſay they) may be taken 'in a two-fold ſenſe: 1. For the *Habit* it ſelf, 'or for that power which is by the Holy Ghoſt 'infuſed into the hearts of the Elect. Or 2. For 'the *Act*, which proceeds from that *Quality*, *Habit* or *Power*, by which we are ſaid '*Actually* to believe in Chriſt: Or that by 'which we do by an actual perſwaſion believe 'in him. That Faith in Scripture is oft taken for an *Act*, no one doubts: That it 'is an Habit, Power or Quality, thoſe Scriptures evince, which ſay, *The Juſt ſhall live 'by Faith*: And, *Without Faith it is impoſſible 'to pleaſe God.* For the Juſt, when aſleep, and 'by an actual Faith, think not on Chriſt, 'do yet then live by Faith, and pleaſe God. 'Faith is alſo in the Scriptures call'd, *Science*, '*Knowledge*, a *full Perſwaſion*; all which reſide 'in the heart, when we do not actually think

'of

'of God. As *Scientia* is by Philosophers put into the prædicament of Quality. Thus a *Child*, 'in whom can be no *Acts* of Knowledge, Sense 'or Perswasion has yet the *Spirit*, the *Power* or '*Habit of Faith*, as All the *Learned do confess*; 'particularly *Martin Bucer*. Besides, they are very particular and distinct in their Endeavours to make it manifest that Faith, and Fears are consistent. For they suppose Faith to be oft conflicting with Doubts and Fears, which they, to continue the use of *Zanchy*'s words, thus solve: 'There is no absurdity in asserting 'Faith to be a firm Perswasion, and yet the Be-'liever disturb'd with afflictive doubts; for 'there being in ever Believer *Flesh*, as well 'as *Spirit*; when the *Spirit* prevails, there is a '*sense* of goodness, sweetly refreshing the Soul; 'a looking to the Gospel-Promise, a relying on 'it, an apprehending Eternal Life as prepared 'for him, rejoycing in it. But when the *Flesh* 'conquers, there is a sight of sin and misery fil-'ling the Soul with the anguish of sorrow; a 'view of its obnoxiousness to death, at which 'he trembles, fearing lest he die eternally, 'which is occasioned by the weakness of our 'Faith, which never, whilst in this Life, arrives 'to that degree of Perfection, as to cure the 'Believer wholly of his Unbelief and Diffi-'dence. It's true, the first Believers have not explicated Justifying Faith as distinct from Assurance so clearly as our more Modern Divines have done; amongst whom the *Westminster* Assembly in their *Confession*, as *Le Blanc* hath well observ'd, have *excelled*. However, they did carefully endeavour to express their Senti-

Zanch. Oper. Tom. 8 loc 7. de Fide.

ments so, as to prevent the despair of such, who, tho' sound Believers, were afflicted with many fears and doubts about the pardon of their sins, and their interest in the Mercy of God. They insisted on a perswasion, a firm belief of the forgiveness of sins; but on such a perswasion as admitting of different degrees was in many so weak and feeble, as not to be always *perceptible*. A Notion, as they explicated it, easie enough to be understood. For in other Instances, what more common than to distinguish between *Acts* and *Habits*? That the *Acts* are seen, when the *Habits* from whence they flow lies undiscover'd. Every one *knows* whether he believes this or the other Report; loves this, or the other person; as well as whether he seeth this, or the other Object. The Acts of the Understanding, and Rational Appetite, when exerted, are as perceivable in their way, as our Sensitive Acts. But then it should be minded, that these Acts are oft look'd upon in their Habits, and when actuated, are commonly blended with such other as are conversant about contrary Objects, and their prevalence over these other so inconsiderable, that it's not at all times discernable, to which if we add, the consideration of the World's Allurements, Satan's many subtle Temptations, *&c.* it cannot but be that true Believers fall into great perplexities about the forgiveness of their sins; which tho' great, destroy not their Faith, nor are they inconsistent with this firm perswasion. Strong fears, and many doubts may consist with a moral certainty of the same Truths. How many have a moral certainty of the Immortality of their Souls,

Souls, and yet grievously tormented with amazing frights about it?

This very Point the Learned Mr. *Baxter* in discourse with me did thus illustrate: It is (saith he) as with a Man so firmly chain'd to the top of a high Spire, as to have the *Greatest Certainty* of his Fastness, yet looking down, could not but fear a Fall.

We may then easily perceive, that from the making Faith to lie in a *perswasion of the pardon of sin*, it cannot be justly inferred, that whoever doubts of God's Mercy in Christ, is destitute of Justifying Faith: for this perswasion may be in the *Habit*, where not in the *Act*, and is consistent enough with strong fears, and many doubts, as the first Reformers expressly affirmed; which is enough to free them from the Reproach of driving by their Doctrine every sound Believer who hath any doubts about his being pardoned, into the Horrour of Despair.

Nor did they so describe Justifying Faith as to give unto any an occasion to expect Heaven, whilst they lived under the Reigning Power of their sins. On the contrary they held,

III. That *none*, who continue to live under the Reigning Power of their Lusts had, or *whilst so, can have Saving Faith.*

'Twas constantly asserted by them, 'That to 'true Justifying Faith, whether strong, or weak, 'Life, and Perpetuity were too essential, and 'inseparable Properties; the first is necessary, 'that it may be a *Living* Faith, exciting in the 'Believer the Life of Christ, that is to say,

'such a Life as ſtirred up in his heart ſuch *new*, 'and *heavenly* motions, thoughts and deſires, 'conform to God's Law, as drove out all earth-'ly Affections. Thus much, they ſaid, was the 'Import of thoſe Scriptures, which ſpeak of '*purifying the heart*, *mortifying the fleſh*, *quickning* '*of the ſpirit*, *crucifying*, *and burying the Old Man*, '*putting on the New*. The Holy Ghoſt in the 'Sacred Scriptures doth ſo very much preſs 'this one thing, eſpecially in the Epiſtles of '*James* and *John*, that it muſt be acknowledged, 'that this is ſo Eſſential a Property of Faith, that 'it cannot be true Juſtifying Faith without it, 'as *all of us unanimouſly ho'd*.

De Perſev. Sanct. Confeſſ. p. 349.

Theſe are the words of the Learned *Zanchy*, who in anſwer to an Objection againſt the *Perſeverance* of the Saints, carrying in it this very Calumny, ['That the Proteſtant Doctrine is 'ſuch as makes Repentance of no uſe, lets looſe 'the Reins to all manner of Profaneneſs, ren-'dring men ſo very ſecure, as to embolden 'them to venture on ſin contrary to the con-'victions of their Conſciences] doth further declare, 'That true Juſtifying Faith cannot 'be where ſin doth reign; that ſound Belie-'vers, altho' they ſin not as the 'wicked do, yet the ſins they 'fall into, are in their own na-'ture moſt worthy of Eternal 'Death. Diſpleaſe God, and are 'puniſhed by him: The Fervour 'of the Holy Spirit in them 'much abated; the flames of their Faith 'quenched; their minds troubled; let them 'therefore repent of their ſins, return to the 'Lord,

Ipſorum [vid. fidelium] lapſus ſuapte naturâ, æternâ morte eſſe digniſſimos; item diſplicére Deo; item punitum iri à Deo, &c. Zanch. de perſ. Sanct. p. 159.

'Lord, as Children to their Father, not cut 'off from Christ, nor wholly forsaken of the 'Holy Spirit. Again; This is the nature of 'true Faith, to stir up in us true Repentance, 'and inflame our hearts with Love to God, and 'a Zeal to please him, and promote his Glory, 'to provoke us sincerely to love our Neighbour, that as much as in us lieth we may live 'peaceably with all men; that it fill our Souls 'with a love to true Holiness, a hatred unto 'all sin, and that in all things we walk worthy 'of the Gospel of Christ.

Zanch. Oper. Tom. 6. loc. 5. de Fide, p. 43.

But the sense of the Reformed may be more fully seen in our *Book of Homilies*, touching the *Doctrine of Justification*, highly approved of by the generality of the Reformed, where it's *thus*; 'Now you shall hear the office and duty of a 'Christian-man unto God. Our office is not 'to pass the time of this present Life *unfruitfully*, and idly, after that we are Baptized, or 'Justified, not caring how *few good works* we 'do, to the Glory of God, and Profit of our 'Neighbours: Much less is it our office, after 'that we be once made Christ's Members, to 'live contrary to the same, making of our 'selves Members of the Devil, walking after 'his Inticements, and after the Suggestions of 'the World, and the Flesh, whereby we know, 'that we do serve the World, and the Devil, 'and not God. For that Faith, which bringeth 'forth (without Repentance) either *Evil Works*, 'or *no Good* Works, is not a Right, Pure, and 'Lively Faith, but a Dead, Devilish, Counterfeit and Feigned Faith, as St. *Paul*, and St. 'James call it.—For the *Right*, and *True Christian*

Serm 3d of Salvat.

'stian Faith is, not only to believe that Holy 'Scriptures are *true*, *but also to have a* Sure 'Trust, *and* Confidence *in* God's Merciful Promi-'ses, to be saved from Everlasting Damnation 'by Christ; whereof doth follow a loving heart 'to obey his Commandments. And this true 'Christian Faith neither any Devil hath, nor '*yet any Man*, which in the outward Profession 'of his Mouth, and the outward Receiving of 'the Sacraments, in coming to the Church, and 'in all other outward Appearances, seemeth to 'be a Christian-man, and yet in his Living and 'Deeds showeth the contrary. For, how can a 'Man have this True Faith, *this Sure Trust and 'Confidence in God, that by the Merits of Christ his 'sins be forgiven, and be reconciled to the Favour 'of God, and to be partaker of the Kingdom of Hea-'ven by Christ*, when he liveth ungodly, *and* 'denieth Christ in his Deeds? *Surely*, no *such 'ungodly man* can have *this Faith, and Trust in 'God.* For, as they know Christ to be the on-'ly Saviour of the World; so *they know also 'that* wicked men *shall* not *enjoy the Kingdom of 'God.* They know, that God Hateth Unrigh-'teousness, that he will destroy all those that 'speak untruly, that those that have done 'good works, (which cannot be done without a 'Lively Faith in Christ) shall come forth into 'the Resurrection of Life, and those that have 'done Evil, shall come unto the Resurrection 'of Judgment: Very well they know also, 'that to them, that be contentious, and to 'them, that will not be obedient unto the 'Truth, but will obey Unrighteousness, shall 'come *Indignation, Wrath*, and *Affliction*, &c.—

'These

'These great and merciful Benefits of God, (if 'they be well considered) do neither minister 'unto us Occasion to be Idle, and to live with-'out doing any good works; neither yet stir-'eth us by any means, to do evil things: But, 'contrary-ways, if we be not Desperate Persons, 'and our hearts Harder than Stones they move 'us to render our selves unto God, wholly, 'with all our *Will*, *Heart*, *Might* and *Power*, to 'serve him in all good Deeds, obeying his Com-'mandments during our Lives, to seek in all 'things his Honour and Glory; not our Sen-'sual Pleasures & Vain Glory, evermore dread-'ing willingly to offend such a Merciful God, '& Loving Redeemer in *Word*, *Thought*, or *Deed*.

Thus much and more to the same purpose in the *Book of Homilies*, evincing how that the First Reformers were far from encouraging any to please themselves with hopes of Heaven, whilst they remained lovers of their Pleasures, more than lovers of God. For, as they oft declared, that Justifying Faith was a lively working Faith; that Faith without Repentance, Love to God, and a Holy Life, was a Dead, a *Devilish* Faith: So altho they denied the meritoriousness of Good works, yet asserted their necessity; even such a necessity of their presence of their following Faith, as made it certain, that no Salvation could be had without them. They who were offended with their being made necessary to Salvation, fearing lest such an Assertion should introduce the merit of good works, held good works necessary *necessitate Præcepti*, as also *necessitate Medii*, taking the means not for an *Ethical*, but *Physical*,

or *Mathematical*, *middle between two extreams*, as the *Æquator* is between the *two Tropicks*; and the *Ecliptick* Line in the *Zodiak*, affirming them (to use the words of *Cromayer*) to be necessary Ante, tho' not *Ad salutem*.

To give my Reader a clearer light into this matter, I will acquaint him with a Controversie, that disturb'd the Churches Peace, soon after the Beginning of the Reformation.

George Major, who, as *Melchior Adamus* in his Life reports, being an Intimate of *Luther*, and *Melanchthon*, and chosen with *Martin Bucer*, *Brentius*, and *Erhardus Snepsius* to concert matters Religious at *Ratisbone* with *Petrus Malvenda*, *Eberhardus Billicus*, *Johannes Hofmeisterus*, and *Johannes Cocklaus*, was a zealous Promoter of Holiness, asserting, *that he, who was not studious of good works, could not obtain Eternal Life*; and that *the study of good works was necessary to Salvation*.

Sed cum nihil sit, quod non male interpretando possit depravari; incurrit & Major in Gravissimam Invidiam & Odium:

quod aliquando, ut fuit Zelotes & Sanctimoniæ Commendator summus, *dixerat, FIERI NON POSSE UT QUI NON STUDEANT BONIS OPERIBUS SALUTEM CONSEQUANTUR ÆTERNAM; & BONORUM OPERUM STUDIUM ESSE NECESSARIUM AD SALUTEM. Adversarii enim ejus, de quibus* Antesignani *fuerunt* Matthias Flacius Illyricus, *Nic.* Gallus, *Nic.* Amsdorffius, *propositionem hanc*, Bona Opera necessaria sunt ad salutem, *interpretati sunt ita; quasi statuerat* Major *juxta* Origenicam, *&* Pontificiam Synecdochen, *BONA OPERA CUM FIDE MERERI REMISSIONEM PECCATORUM & ESSE CAUSAM JUSTIFICATIONIS CORAM DEO.* Melch. Adam Vit. Geor. Major.

This Great Man, tho' extraordinary useful in carrying on the Reformation, having laid down these Assertions, could not escape the Hatred, the Malice and Rage of Good Men, but soon feelingly knew, what were the Fatal Effects of Evil

Evil Surmisings. and Rash Censurings, for no meaner persons than *Flacius Illyricus*, *Nicholaus Gallus*, and *Nicholaus Amsdorffius* affirmed, that according to the *Origenic*, and *Popish Synecdoche*, *Major* meant nothing less than that *Good Works with Faith do* merit the *pardon of sin*, and are *the cause of our Justification in the sight of God.*

In opposition unto *Major*, *Amsdorffius*, who with *Hieronymus Schuffius* a Lawyer, and *Justus Jonas* a Divine, accompanied *Luther* to *Wormes*, held *Good Works to be Noxious and Hurtful to our Salvation.*

This Controversie in its first Appearances is great; and through a warm and peevish management, in its Effects, was very pernicious; and yet, if, as in *Charity* we are bound, we do but believe *George Majors* Solemn Protestations, and Regard what the more moderate judged of *Amsdorffius*, we shall see enough to oblige us to think they meant the *same thing*, and that the Controversie was more owing unto the *mistakes* and *misrepresentations* made of one another than to any Real Differences amongst them. *Melch. Adam. in Vit. Nich. Amsdorf.*

George Major, to vindicate himself from the Charge brought against him, emits a Confession of his Faith, and at Publick Disputations declares, He never taught as *Illyricus*, *&c.* suggested, nor ever held any such Doctrines; but always believ'd, *That the whole of our Justification and Salvation* must be ascribed to the *Mercy* *Major in Confessione Publicè editâ, & Disputationibus; testatus est nunquam se ita sensisse, nunquam ita docuisse*; *sed* totum Justificationis nostræ negotium, & salutis Beneficium in solidum acceptum retulisse, & referre misericordiæ Divinæ, atq; unici Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi merito; idq; solâ fide accipi, quam bona opera, ut fructus certissimi, sequantur. *Quin imò disertè testatus est; se positione illâ, quâ viderit aliquos offendi, deinceps non usurum.* Melch. Adam. Vit. Major.

of

of *God*, and *Merit* of Jesus Christ our only Saviour; and that it is receiv'd only by Faith, attended with Good Works as indubitable Fruits thereof; further protesting, that seeing this Proposition [*Good Works are necessary to Salvation*] was offensive, he would never use it more.

On the other hand *Kromayer* mentions some excusing *Amsdorffius*, they being of Opinion, he held Good Works to be *pernicious to Salvation* only by Accident, *as men place their Trust and Confidence in them.* And adds, that *Amsdorffe* in a Book, written in the *German* Tongue against *George Major*, complains of his being unrighteously reproached by *Major*. 'George Major (saith he) so interprets me, 'as if I had taught, that Good Works are a hin-'derance to Salvation, and a shame to a Chri-'stian. God forgive him; I never believed, 'nor so much as thought that our Opinion 'should have been so falsly and untruly repre-'presented——Such ungodly words should 'not be mentioned or heard in a Christian 'Church.

Sunt qui Amsdorffium *excusant ac si* bona operâ pernicioſa *dixerit ad salutem per accidens, quatenus* Fiducia *in* Operibus *collocetur.* Krom. Theol. Pol. Pol. Art. 12. de bon. oper.

Thus they both complain of Misrepresentation, which gave little or no Relief; for there being amongst 'em many Forming of Parties and Factions, what he, who best understands his own sense, avers, is not to be regarded. The Accuser, tho' under the Government of his Passions, and knows least of his Adversary, obtains the greatest Credit with the generality, which

which occasioned *Adamus* to say, That such is the Credulity of most, such the power of Calumny, that *Major* could never wholly free himself from unjust suspicions. So true is that saying, *Calumniare audacter; semper aliquid hæret.*

Sed, quæ est hominum Credulitas, ac calumniæ efficacitas! effugere suspicionem Doctrinæ diversæ nunquam potuit. Adeo verum est illud. Calumniare Audacter; semper aliquid hæret. Melch. Adam. Vit. Maj.

However, tho' there were different Opinions amongst them managed with most violent Heats, they were rather about words, and lesser matters, than about what was *substantial*, as the *Formula Concordiæ* in *Kromayerus* has it. *Kromayer. ubi supra.*

'The first *Schism*, amongst certain Divines, was 'occasioned by some mens asserting Good 'Works to be necessary to *Salvation*, that it's 'impossible for any to be saved without them, 'and no one ever was: And others taught, that 'Good Works were hurtful. Another *Schism* 'arose amongst some about the *words* [Neces'sary, and Free] one Party holding, that the 'word [Necessary] is not to be affirm'd of our '*New Obedience*, for that is not to proceed from '*Necessity*, or Constraint; but from a *Free* Spi'rit: Others plead for the Retaining this word, 'because *New Obedience* is not left to our plea'sure to render it as we list; for the Regene'rate themselves are bound to *New Obedience*.

This being the true state of the several Controversies about *Good Works*, which were held to be Necessary to Salvation by *George Major*, to be Free, by *Andreas Musculus*, and to be Hurtful, by *Amsdorffius*. The *Formula* proceeds to a *Decision* thus. 'We reject and condemn 'these following Phrases, [*Good Works are neces*'*sary*

'ſary to Salvation. No one was ever ſav'd without 'them. It is impoſſible to be ſaved without Good 'Works]. We do alſo reject, and condem that 'moſt offenſive Phraſe, as pernicious to Chri-'ſtian Diſcipline [That Good Works hinder our 'Salvation.] We Believe, Teach 'and Confeſs, that all men, more 'eſpecially they who are Rege-'nerated, and Renewed by the 'Holy Spirit, are bound to do 'Good Works. And, that in this 'caſe theſe words [Neceſſary, 'Ought, Obliged] are rightly uſed 'even with reſpect to them that 'are Renewed, and are agreeable 'to the Form of ſound words. And 'yet nevertheleſs theſe words [Neceſſity, Neceſ-'ſary] when ſpoken of the Regenerate, muſt 'not be underſtood as if they imported the 'ſame with Coaction, or Force; but only of that 'Obedience, which is Due, to which we are 'Bound, and Obliged; which true Believers, as 'Renewed, do perform, not by the Compul-'ſion and Force of the Law, but ſponteneouſly, 'with a Free Spirit, in as much as they are no 'longer under the Law, but Grace.

Credimus, docemus, & profitemur, omnes quidem homines, præcipuè verò eos, qui per Spiritum Sanctum Regenerati ſunt, & Renovati, ad BONA OPERA facienda DEBITORES eſſe. Et in hâc ſententiâ vocabula illa NECESSARIUM, DEBERE, OPORTERE, rectè uſurpantur, &c.

They condemn not the men as Embracers of Unſound Doctrine, but reject and condemn the uſage of ſome unſafe and hurtful Phraſes, all holding Good Works to be a Duty, to which we are obliged by the holy Commandment, not to be perform'd by Force, and Conſtraint, but freely; not to be truſted in for our Juſtification or Salvation; and yet ſpringing out neceſſarily of a True and Lively Faith, are acceptable unto God.

From

From what hath been collected out of the Writings of the first Reformers, we may see that the *Antinomians* can find no place to shelter themselves under their shadow; for tho' they asserted that Justifying Faith lay in the perswasion of the forgiveness of sin, yet they did, consistently enough with this Notion, deny that Pardon was before Faith, or that Fears and Doubts, and Justifying Faith, could not stand together; or, that a man, whilst remaining under the Reigning Power of his sins, could have Faith: They were *positive*, that the *Justifying Act* of Faith was in order of Nature (as *most*) *antecedent*, or, at least, *simultaneous*, (as others) with *Justification*; that true Believers were continually conflicting with *Fears*, and *Doubts*; and, that that Faith, which was not *fruitful*, in producing Good Works, was not a *Saving*, 'twas a Devilish Faith. Nor did they make it the duty of all men in the World immediately to believe their sins were pardoned: But held convictions of sin, arising from the *Knowledge* of the *Law* to be necessary, and that there were some *Acts* of Faith *Dispositive*, and therefore *Antecedent* to Justification, and to the Justifying Act of Faith, of which I design, if God will, to treat more fully in my *second Part*.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

The ſenſe of the Papiſts, Arminians, *and* Socinians, *about the* Subject *of* Faith. *The different Apprehenſions of the* Orthodox *about the ſame.* Camero, Amyrald, Dally *held, that the* Underſtanding *was the only Subject of Saving* Faith; *yet not* Antinomians. *How they hereby were enabled to* oppoſe Juſtification by Works, *as held either by* Papiſt, Socinian, or Arminian.

THE *denying* Saving Faith *to be an Act of the* Will *is not* Antinomianiſm.

Touching the Subject, or Seat of Faith, whether it be the *Underſtanding* only, or the *Will*, or *both*, the Learned have different Apprehenſions. And ſome great Men, found in the Faith, are poſitive, that 'tis only in the *Underſtanding.*

The *Papiſts*, who for the moſt part make an *Hiſtorick* Faith to be *Saving*, confine it to the *Underſtanding*: And yet *Eſtius*, conform to the ſenſe of *Aquinas*, yields, that it hath its *Riſe* from the *Will*, by which the Underſtanding is inclin'd to believe. *Contarenus* goeth further, holding, that it doth alſo terminate in the *Will*. *Cajetane* is for Faiths being an *Act* of both Faculties; which according to the account *Bonaventure* gives of it, hath been the Opinion of the Antient Schoolmen: And

as

as *Le Blanc*, out of whom I have taken these passages, the *Papists*, if they speak of their *Living Faith*, their *Fides formata*, must place it in the Will, it being *Love*, an Act of the Will, that, according unto them, is the Form of Faith.

Nam si Sermo sit de fide vivâ, & per dilectionem operante, quam formatam appellant, dubitari non potest, quin illa etiam ex eorum mente, non intellectum *tantùm, sed* voluntatem *etiam occupet, & in eâ sedem habet.* Le Blanc Thes. de Subj. Fid. p. 239.

Limborch, giving the sense of the *Remonstrants*, saith, 'That Faith is not meerly an Act of the 'Understanding, nor meerly of the Will, but 'mix'd partly of the one, and partly of the other.

Nos dicimus Fidem nec esse merum Intellectus, nec merum voluntatis Actum; sed mixtum, partim Intellectus, partim Voluntatis. Limb. Theol. Christ. lib. 5. cap. 9. § 22.

Crellius, the *Socinian*, in his Christian *Ethicks*, tells us, 'That Faith may be considered after a 'twofold manner, either as it is in it self *alone*; 'or as in conjunction with its effects; whence it hath a double signification, the one *proper*, the other *figurative*, in which a Metonymy doth meet with a Synechdoche. The first hath been oft spoken unto; it being that *Faith* mentioned in 1 *Cor.* 13 where 'tis distinguished from *Hope*, and *Charity*: The other is that, which doth as much, if not more, belong to the *Will*, as to the Understanding, *&c.*

Fides *duobus modis* consideravi *potest, vel sola, vel cum suis effectis* conjuncta; *adeoq; amplius iterum oritur fidei significatio; altera* Propria; *altera* Figurata, *in quâ* Metonymia *cum* Synecdoche *concurrit. De Priori jam satis dictum; eaque intelligitur,* 1 *Cor.* 13. *ubi* Fides *à Spe, & Charitate distinguitur. Posterior, quæ ad* Voluntatem, *æque, aut magis, quam ad* Mentem *pertinet; est fiducia in Deum, aut etiam Christum collocata, quæ est Assensus firmus Dei Promissis adhibitus, cum vehementi desiderio conjunctus. Itaq; hæc fides sæpe quoque in se complectitur.* Crel. Christ. Ethic. lib. 1. cap. 5.

This

This Point hath been of late years much controverted amongſt the Orthodox. *Le Blanc* brings in *Chamier*, *VVendelin*, *Bucanus*, *River*, and *Altingius* as holding Faith to be ſeated both in the *Underſtanding*, and *VVill*. *Hoornbeeck* adds to theſe as concurring with them the *Dutch Catechiſm*, *Urſine*, *Paraus*, *Trelcatius*, *Tilenus*, and amongſt our *Engliſh* Divines *Preſton* and *Ball*.

Le Blanc ubi ſup.

Hoornb. Vit. & Nov. l. 3. c. 12.

Davenant, and *Wotton*, tho' they are for Faiths being a *Fiducia*, yet diſtinguiſh it from that which imports a *firm Perſwaſion*, and make it to be a *Relying* on Chriſt for Pardon, and an Act of the *Will*, and to belong to both Faculties. Dr. *Ames* in *Le Blanc* fixeth it only in the Will.

Cloppenburg ſaith, that 'tis a Problem amongſt the *Orthodox*, whether the Underſtanding or Will be the Subject of Faith. *Le Blanc* thinks that this Controverſie is but Philoſophical, and may be paſſed by without Diviſion. *Hoornbeeck*, tho' he placeth Faith in the Underſtanding and Will, yet doth not eſteem it neceſſary to contend about it. 'Would not (ſaith he) 'every Difficulty be removed, and the whole 'Controverſie ſo much agitated amongſt Divines about the Subject of Faith be compoſed, 'if, as well we may deny any real Difference 'between the Underſtanding and Will, or between theſe Faculties and the Soul?

Clop. Compend. Socin. Confut. c. 7. Le Blanc. ubi ſup. Hoornb. ubi ſup.

Nemo enim difficultates tolleretur, &c. Witſ. Oecon. Fœd. l. 3. c. 7. § 4.

However there are amongſt the Reformed, ſome Great Divines, highly valued for their Learning, who lay much ſtreſs on this Controverſie and are *Zealous* for Faith, being only an Act of the Underſtanding.

Baronius,

Baronius, tho' he looks on Faith to belong to the *Will* in several respects, as it hath its *Origin* and *Rise* from it, assent it self being an *Imperate* Act of the *Will*, and therefore may be denominated a *Voluntary*, *Free Act*; as also with respect to the *Acts annex'd* unto, and *concomitant* with Faith; for, in that very *instant* Faith in the Understanding assents to Gospel-Promises, and with a firm Judgment applies them to ones self, the *Will* with an ardent Love embraces the Grace and Favour of God. Lastly, with respect to its Fruits, Sanctification, and softning of the Will, follows the Illumination of Faith in the Mind; yet *Faith* properly, subjectively, and with *respect to its* Essence, *is only in the Understanding.* See *L. Blanc ubi supra.*

Camero, discoursing of *Effectual Calling*, refers to that Promise in *Ezekiel* 36. for the taking away the *Heart of Stone*, and *giving a Heart of Flesh*, saith, 'That the Heart of Stone is, by 'the Apostle *Paul*, interpreted by φρόνημα σαρκὸς, a *Carnal* Mind. In another place the 'Apostle is more expres, affirming the Gospel 'to be written in the Fleshly, [not Stony] 'Tables of the Heart, which cannot be under-'stood of the *Will*; [the Law is not written in 'the *Will*] but in the *Mind*, whose part it is to 'understand it. Besides, to *understand* in Scrip-'ture is attributed to the *Heart*. So it is *Rom.* '1. 21. ἀσύνετος καρδία, a *Foolish Heart*, or a Heart 'without *Understanding*. So *Deut.* 29. 4 the 'Lord hath not given you an Heart to Perceive; 'and in *Rom.* 10. *With the heart man believes to* 'Righteousness, where, by the *Heart*, the *Mind* 'undoubtedly is meant; for to Believe is an

'Act of the *Understanding*; that is to say, 'to *Believe* is an Act that hath Truth for 'its *Object*, and therefore must be in the 'Mind. Our Lord Jesus Christ, who promises 'Eternal Life to *Faith alone*, defines *Faith* by 'Knowledge; [*This is Life Eternal to know thee 'the Only True God*, &c.] By the *Heart* then in 'Scripture we must understand the *Mind*, not 'that which Philosophers call simply *Theoretick*, 'but rather the *Practick Understanding*, which 'the *Will* cannot but follow. The same Author on *Matth.* 18. 7. hath it thus; 'Faith cannot be separated from *Love*, and yet Faith is 'in the Understanding; the *Understanding* 'therefore draws with it, and necessarily leads 'the *Will*, otherwise there would be no Inconsistency between a man's being a *sound Believer*, and a *most vicious person*. To this it may be 'objected, That Faith, at least as to some part 'of it, is in the *Will*. It's not our business at this 'time to dispute concerning the *Subject of Faith*, 'and yet, without being guilty of any impertinence, we may assert, that Faith as to some 'part of it, is *necessarily in the Understanding*. 'Now what is that part of *Faith?* they'll 'tell you, 'tis *Knowledge*. But that part of 'Faith, which doth *necessarily* work *Love*. 'Whatever is in the *Understanding*, most certainly is *Knowledge*; not every *Knowledge*, but 'that *Knowledge*, by which thou dost fix it in 'thy *Soul*, that the thing is *thine*, and *cannot be 'separated from Love*. Nor can it be granted, 'that any one *simple Habit* should be in *divers* 'Subjects. They are *Distinct Habits* of the 'Understanding and Will; so that the Will 'and

Cam. praelect. de Eccles. p. 214.

'and Understanding are distinguished from 'each other. In a word, who can deny that 'the τὸ *credere*, to believe, is an *Act* of the '*Mind?* Certainly Belief hath *Truth* for its 'Object; so that he who believeth not, is said 'to make God a Lyar, *&c.*

Amyrald, in the *Theses Salmurienses*, speaking of the *Subject*, in which the Habit of Faith inheres, affirms *it* to be the *Understanding Faculty*. 'This (faith 'he) should be embrac'd *by all*, 'but controverted by none, ex- 'cept by such as have not closely 'studied this Point. To have 'Faith imports nothing else than 'to *Believe*; to believe is to be 'perswaded of the Truth of a 'thing, and therefore must be- 'long to the *Understanding*. For *Truth* is the 'Object thereof, and *Perswasion* is no otherwise 'than by admitting or receiving into the Mind 'those Reasons, and Arguments, by which a 'thing demonstrates it self to be *True*. Nor can 'any other thing be gathered from the Holy 'Scriptures. If we consult those expressions 'used to represent Faith unto us, whether they 'be *Proper*, or *Metaphorical*, they all direct us to 'conclude Faith to belong to the Mind. To 'begin with what words are proper; The *Ob-* 'ject of Faith is said to be *Truth*; the *Faculty* the '*Heart*, or *Mind*. (*Heart* in Scripture, and amongst 'other good Authors, denotes the *Understand-* 'ing.) The *Effect* arising from Faith is *Know-* 'ledge, *Wisdom*, *&c.* The *State* of them, who 'attain unto this is such, that they, who are in

Subjectum cui Habitus Fidei innascitur atq; inhæret, facultatem iam esse quæ in homine Intellectus *appellatur, debet esse extra controversiam apud* omnes, *qui saltem rem istam considerant non omnino oscitanter, &c.* Thes. Salmur. de Fide par. pri. § 15. &c.

'it are said to be *Intelligent*, and *Knowing*; and 'they who are in *Unbelief* are *Fools*, and *Unwise*. 'The *Metaphors* which import the same Notion 'of Faith, are numberless. This, and much more hath *Amyrald*, with whom many great Divines agree.

Spanhemius, in his *Exercitations* about *Universal Grace*, provoking his Adversary to the *National Synod* of *Dort*, endeavours to press him with that *Synods* declaring, 'That from the 'Holy Scriptures, it's clear, God infuses in- 'to our Hearts the *New Qualities* of *Faith*, *Obe- 'dience*, and the *Sense of his Love*, which cannot '(faith *Spanhem*) consist with *Amyrald's* mak- 'ing the Understanding the only Seat of Faith.

Synodus profitetur, Sacras Scripturas testari, Deum novas Qualitates Fidei, Obedientiæ, ac sensûs amoris sui Cordibus *nostris infundere. Hoc verò consistere non potest, si* Fidei Subjectum *sit tantum intellectus, ut docet vir doctus in Thes. suis* de Fide. Span. Exercit. Grat. Univers. p. 1675, 1676.

To this the Learned *Dalley*, in his Apology for the two National Synods, namely *Abenson*, and *Chaventon* in *France*, returns this Answer; 'Tis true, the Synod declares, that *Faith*, *Obe- 'dience*, *and the sense of God's Love are infused in- 'to our hearts*. For *Faith* belongs to the *Under- 'standing*, and so doth a *sense* of *Love* (to perceive 'a thing, being the part of the Understanding; 'not of the Will;) *Obedience* is partly in the 'Mind, and partly in the *Will*, which is also the 'Heart. But that the *Heart*, as distinct from the 'Mind, is the Seat of the Gifts of the Spirit is

Quod ait Synodus de Fidem, *&* Obedientiam, *&* sensum Amoris Dei Cordibus nostris infundi, *verum esse fatentur* FRATRES *Fides enim* Menti, *quæ* Cor *est, sensus istm* Menti, (*sentire enim* Mentis *est, non voluntatis*;) Obedientia *partim* Menti, *partim* Voluntati, *quæ & ipsa* Cor *est, convenit.* Cor *verò ab* Intellectu distinctum *sedem esse istorum omnium Spiritus donorum, accusatoris dictatum est; non est Synodi* Decretum. Dall. Apol. p. 658.

'the

'the *Dictate* of the *Accuſer*, not a *Decree* of 'the *Synod*.

However, tho' they made Faith to lie only in the Underſtanding, yet held it to be ſuch a *Practical Aſſent* unto *Goſpel Truths* as effectually engaged the *Will* moſt intenſely to *Love* Chriſt; and this Love to be ſuch as influenced them to receive the Lord Jeſus on his own Terms, and keep his Commands; aſſerting alſo, Faith and Love, tho' diſtinct Graces, to be Inſeparable, and Saving Faith to be Prolifick of Good Works; ſo that where theſe were abſent, there the Faith was not ſaving; ſo carefully did they Fence againſt *Antinomianiſm*.

Beſides, by this Notion of *Saving Faith*, they kept themſelves at a great diſtance from the *Arminian*, and *Socinian Dogmata* about Juſtification, as will appear plainly on a fairer and juſt propoſal of their Sentiments in theſe Points.

Crellius, conſidering *Faith*, as *conjunct* with its Effects, ſuch as *Hope*, *Love*, and *Obedience*, aſſerts it to be Juſtifying as thus conjoyn'd, and ſo makes Good Works to have the ſame Intereſt in our Juſtification, that Faith hath.

'That Faith (ſaith he) by which we are 'Juſtified, or which on our part is the neareſt 'and only *Cauſe* of our Juſtification, is a *Firm* '*Hope* in the *Divine Promiſes*, placed in God 'through Chriſt, begetting Obedience to the 'Commands; the *Fiducia*, or Firm Hope taken '*properly*, may be the *Genus* of Juſtifying Faith; 'but *Obedience* to Chriſt's Commands, flowing 'from this Firm Hope, may by the *Form*; or, 'as St. *James* hath it, is the *Life*, the *Soul of* 'Faith. This Faith, thus defin'd, is that, which

Crel. Ethic. Christ. lib. 1. c. 5.

'is required as necessary to Salvation under the 'New Testament.

As *Crellius*, in his *Christian Ethicks* gives this account of Faith; in like manner he doth the same, on the *Romans*, and *Galatians*, and concurs with *Slichtingius* in his Commentary on the *Hebrews*, in composing which he had a great hand, as *Slichtingius*, in his *Preface* doth ingeniously confess, where it's thus: 'Faith, if 'properly, and strictly taken, differs from Obe-'dience; and our coming unto God: For, 'Faith must be in him, who seeks God, before 'he doth it. Faith more *largely* by a *Synechdo-dochical Metonymy*, comprehends within it its 'Effects, namely, all *Works of Piety* and *Righ-'teousness*.

Rom. 3. 22. Gal. 2. 16.

Est vero Commentarius hic, vivente adhuc Joanne Crellio — *Collega meo disertissimo à me confectus & elucubratus, ita ut in eruendis Epistolæ istius sensibus omnis mihi cum* Crellio *sociata fuerit opera, idq; ita ut ei primas hic partes merito deferre debeam*; *Præfat. ad Lector. Slichtin. in Heb. c. 11. v. 1.*

John 5. 24.

Fides in Christum trahit secum observationem mandatorum ejus, quæ nisi sequatur, vanam, & irritam esse fidem oportet.

Fides duas habet partes Primarias; *una est* Fiducia *in Deum per Christum, inque promissiones ejus collocata*; *altera* Obedientia, *ac observantia Præceptorum ejus.* Wolzog. Instruct. ad util. Lect. Lib. N. T. cap. 6.

Smalc. Refut. Thes. de Caus. peccat. p. 450.

Slichtingius, on *John*, thus; 'Faith in Christ carries with it 'an observation of his Commands, and without it all Faith 'is vain, yea dead. — In this Faith 'therefore an *observation* of Christs 'Commandments is included. *Wolzogenius*, 'Faith hath two Principal parts; the one is a *Trust* in 'God through Christ, and in his 'Promises; the other is *Obedi-'ence* to his Commandments. *Smalcius* in his Refutation of *Frantzius* is more expres.

Even

'Even as the Soul is the Essential 'Form of Man; so are Works 'and Christian Piety the *Essence*, 'and *Form* of Faith. Trust in God 'through Christ may be *Ratione* 'distinguished from true Piety, 'and Obedience; but yet there 'is no *Real* difference between 'them. *Socinus* himself thus; '* That Faith by which we are Justified, according to the Apostle *Paul*, is a Trust in God 'through Christ, from whence *Obedience* to his 'Commandments doth necessarily flow; for it 'is as the form and substance of this Faith.

* *Fidei siquidem nomine ex qua Justificemur, intelligit Paulus Fiduciam ejusmodi in Deo, per Christum collocatam, ex quâ necessariò Obedientia Præceptorum Christi nascatur; quæ etiam Obedientia sit tanquam forma & substantia istius Fidei.* Socin. Lect. Sacr. in Bibl. Polon.

Thus the *Socinians*, distinguishing between *Faith*, as taken *properly*, or *strictly*; and *figuratively*, or *largely*, make the *first* to be only a *Fiducia*; the second, which they affirm to be *Justifying*, is comprehensive of *Hope*, *Love*, and *Works*, which (say they) are the Essential form of a Living Justifying Faith, whereby they introduce Justification by Works: Not the *Merit* of our Works: This they strenuously oppose. So *Wolzogenius*, who, speaking of the Merit of our Good Works, assures us, 'That if 'we look closely into this matter, nothing can 'appear to be more certain and true than that 'we *cannot by our Good Works* Merit any thing 'of God. For, he is our *Creator*, and *as such*, 'hath a right to all we can do without the proposal of any Compensation or Reward— Besides, it's a Dictate of Right Reason, that 'the *Fruit* belongs *to him that soweth*, and surely 'it is *God that worketh in us to will, and to do of* 'his own good pleasure. These and some other

Wolzog. in *Luc. c.* 17. *v.* 7.

considerations he offers against the *Merit* of our Good Works. The same is done by *Crellius*. *Socinus* is vehement in his opposition against all *Merit*, which must *necessarily* be done by them, who ascribe so much to Free Grace, as to deny both the Satisfaction of Christ's Death, and *Merit of his Righteousness*.

Crel. in Eph. c. 3 v. 1. 11. Socin. Frag. de Justific.

'That *Frantzius*, and all others, (saith *Smalcius*) may know our sense in this matter, 'we declare against all *Merit* whatever; for, 'neither the word [*Merit*] or any thing signifying what is equivalent thereunto, can be 'found in Scripture; and what was said of Christ touching his *Exaltation* for his being 'obedient to the Death of the Cross, imports 'no more than that if he had not been obedient, he would not have been *Exalted*. But 'that he did not *Merit*, is manifest from the 'following words [He *gave him* (ἐχαρίσατο) *a name above every name*] for *Merit*, and *Free Gift* are incompatible with each other.

Et ut nostram hac de re sciat, sententiam Frantz. & alii omnes, dicimus, nullum omnino dari Meritum, *quemadmodum nec ipsa vox* MERITI *in toto sacro Codice usquam reperitur, nec quicquam ei æquipolens; & quod ad Christum attinet, non ob aliam causam dicitur* Phil. 2. *eum ideo Exaltatum esse, quòd usq; ad mortem obediens fuerit, quam quod sine ista obedientia exaltatus non fuerit. Meritum autem in eo nullum fuisse, hinc apparet, quòd Apostolus ibidem mox addit; &* donavit, (ἐχαρίσατο) *ei nomen quod (est) supra omne Nomen. Nihil autem merito propriè accepto cum Donatione Commune est.* Smalc. contra Frantz. Disp. 3. p. 88.

Slichtingius, on the *Philippians* saith, 'That 'the word *Merit*, as it is not in all the Sacred Writings attributed to *Man's Works*, with 'respect to *God*; so neither is it unto Christ's.

Idco nec usquam in sacris Literis Meriti, *aut* Merendi *voces magis de* Christo, *quam de* nobis, *respectu Dei, usurpantur; ut longè præstat cum Scripturâ loqui, & Christi* Obedientiæ *potius, ac* Morti *salutem nostram tribuere, quam* Meritis, *per illud enim* GRATIA *Dei non tantum non obscuratur, sed etiam longè magis illustratur; sat per Meritum propriè dictum* imminuitur, *&* tollitur. Slicht. in Phil. c. 2. v. 9.

Whence

Whence it's much better, with the Holy Scriptures to aſcribe Salvation to Chriſt's Death and Obedience, rather than unto his *Merits*; for to do ſo, doth not *obſcure, but illuſtrate the Grace of God*; whereas *Merit* taken properly doth *Eclipſe*, yea *Deſtroy* Free Grace.

Theſe paſſages may ſuffice to ſhew how much the *Socinians* are againſt the *Merit of Good Works*; and, yet hold our Works to be an *Eſſential* of that Faith, which they ſay is a cauſe of our Juſtification.

Faith, as it apprehends *Chriſt's Righteouſneſs for Juſtification*, they explode; and, by making it an Act of the Will, they take within the compaſs of its *Formal Nature*, *Hope*, *Love*, and *Obedience*, and to bring in Good Works amongſt the Cauſes of our Juſtification.

'The *Nature*, and *Efficacy* of True Faith, 'ſaith *Slichtingius*) lieth in this, that it *begets* 'Love to God: Who can believe he ſhall ob- 'tain Eternal Life, if he loves his Neighbour 'that will not love him? But becauſe of ſome 'difficulties, it may ſo happen that a Man may 'be more diſcouraged with the preſent Labour, 'than mov'd by future Advantages. Love is 'therefore required with *Faith*, as a *Condition* 'annex'd to the Divine Promiſe, that, by the 'fulfilling it, we may attain *Salvation*; but it's 'no wonder, that they who define Faith by our 'apprehending and applying *Chriſt's Merit*, do 'exclude Love, and every other *Good Work* *Slicht. in* 'from the *Cauſes* of our Salvation. *1 Cor.* 13.

'To ſpeak accurately, Faith is not the In- *v.* 13. and in 'ſtrumental Cauſe of our Juſtification, and yet *Heb.* 11. 6. 'it is an Efficient, not a Principal, but the *Cauſa*

'*ſine*

'*sine quâ non* of it, whence it is, that we are said 'to be *Justified by Faith*. But this *Faith*, under 'the *New Testament*, is not, as *Erantzius* dreams, 'an *Application of Christ's Merit*, but a *Trust* in 'God thro Christ, whose nature is, in hope of 'the Eternal Life promised by Jesus Christ, to 'Obey him. So *Smalcius* against *Erantzius*. 'As we must take heed, lest we, (as many at this time) do make Holiness of Life the *Effect* 'of our Justification in the sight of God: So we 'must look to it, that we believe not this *Holiness* to be our *Justification*: Or, that it is an '*Efficient*, or *Impulsive* Cause, but only a *Causa sine quâ non*. Our Good Works, that is, the '*Obedience* we render unto Christ, tho they are 'not the *Efficient*, or *Meritorious Cause*, yet are 'they a *Causa sine quâ non* of our *Justification* 'before God and of our Eternal Salvation. So 'far *Socinus*.

Disp. 4. *p.* 103. *Socin. Synop.* 2. *Justific.*

Socin. Thes. de Justific.

But tho' they make Justification by Faith to be the same with that by Good Works; yet that they may reconcile this their Doctrine with what hath been delivered by the Apostle *Paul*, who denieth Justification by Works; they find it necessary to assert, That we are in this Gospel-day under two *Laws*; the one called the Law of *Obedience*, or the *Rule* of Duty; the other the Law of *Reward* or *Punishment*.

LEGES, *quæ ad quodvis bene constitutum Regimen requiruntur, sunt duplicis generis. Primò, sunt* LEGES, *quibus præscribuntur subditis* OFFICIA *quomodo se quisq; in suis actionibus gerere debeat; seu quid cuique Faciendum vel*

Volzogenius is full in delivering the *Socinian* sense on this Point. 'In every well constituted Government (saith he) there are 'Laws of two sorts: The first 'are such as shew the Subject's 'Duty, *what he must do*; and, 'what

'what he must not. These Laws, 'to distinguish them from the 'other, are called *Præcepts*, and 'Prohibitions. Then there are 'Laws, by which *Rewards* are 'proposed to good Subjects for 'the Encouragement of their 'Obedience, and *Punishments* 'threatned against the Disobe-'dient. Both these sorts of 'Laws, or Rules are in the Kingdom of Christ.

Omittendum sit. Qua LEGES *ad distinctionem cæterarum* PRÆCEPTA *&* INTERDICTA *vocantur. Deinde sunt* LEGES, *quibus propositis fidis, ac meritis subditis* PRÆMIA, *pro ipsorum Obedientiâ, ac malificis meritæ pœnæ. Hæc duo* LEGUM *genera reperiuntur etiam in Regno Christi.* Wolzog. Instruct. ad Lect. lib. N. T. c. 4

Answerable to these two *Laws*, or *Rules* of *Duty* and the *Promise*, there is a twofold *Obedience*. By the Rule of the Precept the highest & most absolutely Perfect Obedience is injoyned. By the Law of the Promise, or *Rule* of the *Reward*, Faith, and Repentance, with a certain purpose of Amendment is what entitles to the Reward. 'There is (saith *Salmacius*) a 'two-fold *Obedience*, and a double consideration of 'Perfection: The first is, that we *never transgress*, or *deviate* from *God's Commands*: The 'other is, that no *one Habit* of Sin remain in us 'The first sort of Obedience we do not think 'necessary to Salvation, it being sufficient, if 'there be always a *Tendency* towards it: The 'other is necessary to Salvation, and its ob-'servance *possible*.

Duplex datur Obedientia Præceptis Divinis præstanda, & ita duplex Perfectionis consideratio: Altera est, ut nemo unquam quicquam committat

adversus Præcepta *Dei; altera est, ut in nullo ullius Peccati habitu hæreat* —*Illam priorem*, &c. Smalc. contr. Frantz. Disp. 12. p. 427.

That God in distributing Rewards observes another Rule than that of the Præcept, even that of the *Promise*, which contains a Grant of the Reward to him who is upright in heart, *Wolzogenius* doth, in the plainest Terms affirm.

'Christ

'Christ (saith he) is our *King*, but so that (as 'all other Kings ought to be) he is at the same 'time our Father, and Faithful Pastor: His 'Promises are limited by certain *Conditions*, and 'yet these *Conditions* are not over *Rigidly* in-'sisted on, in those cases where somewhat of '*Ignorance* or other *Infirmity* intervenes. The 'Promise of *Eternal Life* Requires *an Observa-'tion of his Commands*; but he, knowing our 'Frailties, will not impute to us our daily sins, 'if so be there remains in us an *Upright Heart*, 'and True Repentance, and a certain Purpose 'of Amendment.

Walzog. Instr. ad util. Lect. lib. N.T. c. 6.

By this Distinction they endeavour to Reconcile *Paul*, and *James*. 'Tho' *Paul* (saith 'Socinus) affirms, [That *we are justified by Faith, 'and not by the Works of the Law*;] and *James*, '[That *we are not justified by Faith alone*, but *by 'Works*,] yet on an explication of the words '[Faith] and [Works] the Agreement be-'tween them will be made manifest. For *Paul* 'doth mean by [Faith] such a Trust in God 'through Christ, as necessarily begets Obedi-'ence to his Commandments, an Obedience 'that is as the *Form*, and *Substance* of Faith; and 'by [Works] he understands a Perfect Obser-'vance of the Divine Law, and all its Præ-'cepts: By which, because of the weakness of 'our Flesh, none can be justified. *James* by '[Faith] means such an Assent as is *imperfect*, 'and without Good Works; and by [Works] 'not the most perfect, but that Obedience on-'ly which is necessarily required of us, that we 'may appear Just before him. And accordingly *Paul* declares, that we are not justified by those *Works*,

VVorks, which are in all respects *conform* to the Law; but by a *Faith* informed by *Obedience*. *James*, we are not justified by a *Faith* void of Good *VVorks*, but by *VVorks*, which, tho' they are not most perfect, yet are such as may be justly denominated *Obedience*, or *Good VVorks*.

To this Effect *Socinus* doth oft express himself, which compared with what I have taken out of *VVolzogenius*, and *Smalcius*, is, as if it had been said, 'That we must distinguish between 'the *Law* of *Precepts*, or the *Rule of Duty*; and 'the *Law of Rewards*, or *Rule of the Promise*. 'That by the *Law*, as it is the *Rule of Duty*, *Perfection* in the strictest sense, as exclusive of the 'least Dissonancy from the Command, is required. But by the *Law* of the *Reward*, or '*Rule* of the *Promise*, that Obedience which is 'with a sincere and upright heart answering the 'Rule of the Promise is accepted. Besides, 'there is a double consideration of *Faith*, and of 'Good *Works*. There is a Faith *perfected* with 'Love and Obedience, and a Faith *Inchoate*, a 'bare Assent without Love and Obedience. 'There are Works, answering the Rule of 'Duty in every respect conform to the Com'mands; and there are Works, which, tho' '*Imperfect*, may justly be denominated *Good*, to 'which, by the *Rule of the Promise*, the Reward 'belongs. *Lect. Sacra Fragment. de Justif.*

Faith Perfected; or, which hath Love and Obedience for its *Formal Reason* by which alone, saith St. *Paul*, we are justified, in opposition to *Works*, is the same (say these *Socinians*) with what St. *James* means by *Works*; so that the *Works Paul* excludes from having an Interest in our

our Justification are such, as are conform to the Rule of Duty, and absolutely perfect. The *Faith* St. *James* affirms to be insufficient for our Justification, is an *Imperfect* Faith without Works; and the *Works*, by which (St. *James* saith) we are justified, is Faith inform'd with such Works as are *conform'd* to the *Rule* of the *Promise*.

Vid. Crit. in Rom. 8.32. Gal. 2. 16. 1 Cor. 1.30.

This in short is the *Socinian Scheme*; *viz.* Faith is an *Act* of the *Will*; having, for its *Essential Form*, *Hope*, *Love*, and *Obedience*; which, tho' imperfect, as not fully conform to the *Rule of Duty*, and therefore no way *Meritorious*; yet as Answering the Law of the Reward, or *Rule of the Promise* is perfect, and is a *Cause*, not *Instrumental*; but *sine quâ non*, of our Justification.

By this Notion they frame of Justifying Faith, they make it one Moral Habit, comprizing within its own nature every *Good Work*, and when they assert *Justification* to be only by *Faith*, they in doing so, raise *Good Works* to the dignity of being a *Causa sine quâ non*, of Justification. By the word [*Faith*] they understand *Trust*, *Hope*, *Love*, and *Obedience*, and consequently to be *Justified by Faith*, is to be *Justified* by *our Trust*, *Hope*, *Love*, & *Obedience*, or *Good Works*.

The *Arminians* are of the same mind with the *Socinians*; for in their *Apology*, they freely declare, 'That whoever will impartially examine the *Socinian* Notion in this matter, can-

Et sane, si quis ea, quæ à Socino dicuntur in hâc materiâ, sine gratiâ, sine odio expendat, is velit, nolit, confiteri tandem cogetur, eum in substantia Rei cum Reformatis consentire, manente hoc solum Discrimine causam semper προηγουμενην exsipe. Exam. Censur. cap. 10. pag. 114.

not

'not but confeſs, that *Socinus*, as to the ſub-
'ſtance of this Doctrine (excepting that one
'particular about the External Procuring Cauſe
'of our Juſtification) holds the ſame with the
'Reformed.

But how boldly ſoever the *Arminian* aſſert an Agreement between *Socinus*, and the *Reformed*; their Aſſertion can import no more than a Free Acknowledgment, that there is a Harmony between *themſelves*, and the *Socinians*. For the *Reformed*, who place Faith in the *Will*, as well as in the *Underſtanding*, and make it to be a *Work*, do by no means allow of its Juſtifying us, *as* a *Work*, but exclude all *Works* from being either an *Inſtrumental Cauſe*, or a *Cauſa ſine qua non*; or *any other* cauſe whatſoever of our Juſtification. And they that confine Faith to the Underſtanding hold, that Faith is not a *Work*, and therefore cannot juſtifie, as *ſuch*; whereby they effectually deſtroy Juſtification by *Works*, and ſet themſelves at the greateſt diſtance from the *Arminian*, and *Socinian Errors*.

Excellent *Camero* hath deliver'd the ſenſe of them, who make the *Underſtanding*, the *only Subject of Faith*, with much clearneſs, aſſuring us, 'That we muſt abide by this, that Faith
'is not a Work. The *Papiſts* (ſaith he) think
'they preſs us with this Argument; *viz.* ſeeing
'Faith is a *Work*, the aſſerting that we are Juſti-
'fied by Faith, can import nothing leſs than
'that we are Juſtified by *ſome Work*. There are
'others, who profeſs to abhor nothing more
'than this *Popiſh* Doctrine, who confeſs, That
'*Faith is a Work*, but then add, that *it* doth not
'Juſtifie *as a Work*. But the Scriptures do always

'diſtinguiſh

'distinguish *Faith* from *Works*, yea oppose *Faith* 'to *Works* in the matter of our Justification. And 'the *Papists* themselves, when they say we are 'Justified partly by *Faith*, and partly by *Works*, 'unless they will be guilty of a very gross ab'surdity, must distinguish the one from the 'other. *Faith* therefore *is not a Work*: that it 'is called the *Work of God*, *Joh.* 6. 29. is only 'by way of *Allusion*, as *Paul*, *Rom.* 3. 27. calls 'Faith a Law. The *Jews* continually glorying 'in their *Works*, in the *Law*, in their *Preroga'tives*, as they were the Children of *Abraham*, 'Christ in answer unto them, having attributed '*Justification* to *Faith*, useth their own words, 'who expecting to *be Justified by* Works; 'Christ doth as it were thus speak unto them: 'Will ye have Life by your *Works*? then *work* 'this *Work*, Believe in the Son of God. How'ever, there is this difference between *Faith*, 'and *Works*: *Faith* gives nothing to God; it on'ly receives: *Works* are an *Eucharistical Sacri'fice*, which we offer unto God. Faith is the '*Instrument*, it is as the *Hand* of the Soul by 'which we receive saving Benefits from God.

'Laying this Foundation, we go on, and af'firm, That *Justification is by* Faith, *not by* 'Works. 1. The Apostle, when he doth pro'fessedly dispute of Justification, he never op'poses the *Works of Holiness*, or *Sanctification* 'unto *Works* of the *Law*; which undoubtedly 'he would have done, if he had thought that 'any thing in our Justification must be attri'buted to *Works*. His Adversaries making it 'their business to expose him, as one, who, by 'by his *Doctrine*, lets loose the Reins to all

'manner

'manner of *Licentiousness*, if he had thought 'that Justification had been by any *Works*, what-'soever, could easily have answered them by 'saying, He *denyed not Justification by Works*, 'but earnestly contended for its being by the *Works of Sanctification*. But that he never did for he always opposed *Faith* to *Good Works*.

2. 'All our Salvation consists in the Free-'Pardon of Sin, which God in the Gospel 'doth offer unto men, not singly, but so as 'thereby to invite them to *Repentance*: If 'there had been no place for the Remission of 'Sin, a Sinner could never entertain a thought 'about *Repentance*; and in this respect would 'be in the same case with the *Devils*, who Re-'pent not, because without the least hope of 'Pardon. God, therefore to take away all '*Dispair* from men, offers them the *Forgiveness* 'of *Sin*, that is to say, in his Son Jesus Christ. 'For no *Remission without a Sacrifice*, and no 'Expiatory *Attoning* Sacrifice, besides that of 'Christ. Now what Faculty of the Soul is 'that by which the *Remission* of Sin is *Perceiv-*'ed? None surely but *Faith*. 'Tis *Faith* 'which *Believeth* God, who maketh the Pro-'mise. *Hope* is that, which *expects* the *thing* 'Promised: But *Charity*, beholding the *Good-*'ness of him who Promises, in the Excellen-'cy of the Promise *Loves* him. Wherefore 'seeing 'tis *Faith* only, which acquiesces in the '*Free Promise* of God through Jesus Christ; 'and *apprehends the Forgiveness of Sin*; Justifi-'cation is by the Holy Ghost ascrib'd only un-'to Faith. However by the way it must be ob-'serv'd, That no one doth certainly and seri-

'ously believe the Promise made unto him, but 'he *immediately Repents of his Sin*. For on his believing all occasion of Dispair is taken out of 'the way, and such is the Excellency, Beauty, and Glory of the Promise, as to take off 'the Heart from the Love of the World; 'whence it may be truly said, that we are 'Justifyed by Faith alone, and that we are 'Sanctifyed by Faith alone, for 'tis *Faith that 'purifyeth the Heart*, Act. 13. 9.

3. 'The reason why God forgives the Sins 'of the Penitent is this, namely *Because satisfaction is made to Gods Justice by Jesus Christ*, 'who has purchased this Grace for us: But the '*satisfaction* of Christ cannot be *apprehended* by 'us any other way but by Faith: Justification 'therefore must be ascribed only unto Faith. 'So far *Camero*.

There are other Arguments, which he urgeth to this very purpose. But from what he hath here delivered, It's plain, that *Faith*, not *being an Act of the* Will, is *not a Work*; but is distinguished from it, and opposed unto it, and that therefore when it is said, we *are Justified by Faith*; it cannot be that we are *Justified by a work*. That Christs satisfaction hath *purchased Pardon*; which can be apprehended by us no otherwise than *by Faith*; that Faith is the *Instrument*, or as the hand of the Soul by which we receive forgiveness. That tho from this Faith, *Hope*, *Love*, and *Obedience immediately flow*, and are *inseparable*; yet they are no cause at all of our Justification; which is enough to make it manifest that one, who is far from *Antinomianism*, may deny

Faiths

Faiths being an *Act of the Will*, and confine it wholly to the Underſtanding. For *Faith*, *Hope*, and *Love*, may be diſtinct Graces, though whilſt in this Life inſeparable: and ſo long as *Hope*, *Love*, and *Goſpel Obedience* are held to be *inſeparable* from Faith there is, there can be no danger in placing Faith only in the *Underſtanding*. But many Advantages againſt the *Papiſt*, *Arminian*, and *Socinian*, to the Exaltation of the Glory of *Free Grace* are hereby obtained.

CHAP. VII.

A Summary of the Principal Antinomian *Errors, compared with the oppoſite* Truths. *The preſent Controverſie not with the* Deſcribed Antinomians. *The* Agreement *between the Contending Brethren in* Subſtantials *ſuggeſted. The Concluſion.*

THeſe Doctrines I have thought meet to vindicate from the unrighteous charge of *Antinomianiſm*; becauſe, by a giving them up for *Antinomian*, not only many who abhor it are accuſed for being Abettors of it; but ſome important *Truths*, which ſtrike at the very Root of this *Error* are repreſented to be *Antinomian*.

It hath been the care of the *Papiſt*, *Arminian*, and *Socinian*, to inſinuate into the minds of Perſons, leſs ſtudied in theſe Controverſies,

as if the *Orthodox Protestant* had, in opposition unto them run into the *Antinomian* Extreme; and have inserted in the Catalogue of *Antinomian Errors* several Gospel-Truths, particularly the ensuing *Assertions*.

1. *That Jesus Christ is a* Second Adam, *a* Root Person, *and* Publick Representative, *with whom the* Covenant of Grace *is made.*

2. *That the* Guilt, *as well as* Punishment *of Sin was laid on Christ.*

3. *That the* Covenant *of* Grace *is not* Conditional *in that sense the* Papists *hold it.*

4. *That* Faith *is a certain,* and a full Perswasion, *wrought in the heart of a man through the Holy Ghost, whereby he is* Assured *of the Mercy of God promised in Christ,* that his Sins are forgiven him.

5. *That* Justifying *Faith is not an* Act *of the* Will, *but of the* Understanding *only.* Tho' the *Papists* for some special Reasons oppose not this Notion; yet the *Arminians* and *Socinians* do, to the end they may bring in *Works* among the *Causes* of our *Justification.*

These *Assertions* are of such a Nature, as do really cut the very sinews of *Popery*, and *Socinianism*; as I have already in part cleared, and hope more fully to evince in my *Second Part*: But by those, who deviate from the Truth; all but the last have been heretofore, and now the last is, by men more Orthodox, made the *Source* of *Antinomianism*; the *Spring* and *Fountain*, from whence

whence the following *Concluſions* do naturally, and neceſſarily flow. Thus they infer from the

First, *That Chriſt muſt be our* Delegate, *or* Subſtitute, *who* Believed, Repented, *and* Obeyed, *to exempt the* Elect *from doing either, as neceſſary to their Pardon, and Salvation.*

Second, *That Chriſt ſo took our Perſon, and Condition on him, as to have the* Filth, *and* Pollution *of our Sins laid on him.*

Third, *That the Promiſe of Pardon, and Salvation is made to* Sinners *as* Sinners.

Fourth, *That the* Pardon *of Sin was before Faith, even whilſt we are in the Heighth of Iniquity, and Enemies againſt God, and Deſpiſers of Jeſus Chriſt.*

Fifth, *That We may have Saving Faith, tho' our Wills remain unchanged, and obſtinately ſet againſt God.*

Theſe are the *Antinomian Errors* ſaid to flow from the above-mentioned *Aſſertions*, which, if once granted, we ſhall be neceſſitated to acknowledge, that there will be no Uſe *at all of the* Law, nor of *Faith, Repentance, Confeſſion of Sin*, &c. but we may live, as we liſt, and yet be ſaved.

But we have made it plainly to appear, that theſe Points are ſo far from being *Antinomian*, that they do carry with them a Confutation of that *Error*. That the Reader may the more

clearly see the *Difference* there is between the one, and the other; I will be very particular in shewing the opposition.

Assertion I.

That Jesus Christ is a Second Adam, *a* Root-Person, *and* Publick Representative, *with whom the Covenant of Grace is made.*

From this Assertion it necessarily follows, that Christ must have a Spiritual Seed, and be the Representative of that Seed, so far as *Adam* would have been of *his*, if he had perfectly obeyed. And it is certain, that if *Adam* had rendred the Required Obedience, *his Posterity would have been, not only made* Righteous, *and derive a* Holy Nature *from him, but be also* obliged to Personal Holiness. In like manner, so is it with the *Posterity* of the Second Adam.

The utmost then that can be fairly inferred from Christ's being a Second Adam, &c. is, *That he hath a Spiritual Off-spring; That they be Justified by his Righteousness; derive a New Nature from him, and be obliged to a* Personal Obedience.

The Opposition.

Antinomian.	Truth.
1. *Christ is our Delegate or Substitute.*	1. *Christ* is a *Second Adam*, but *not our Delegate or Substitute.*

As

As the *First Adam* was the Head, and Publick Representative of his Posterity; but not their *Substitute*, or *Delegate*; so Christ, tho' a *Publick Repeesentative*, yet not our *Substitute*, as *D. O.* doth excellently well show, when he saith, 'That Christ and Believers are neither 'One Natural *Person*, nor a Legal, or Politi-'cal *Person*, nor any such Person, as the Laws, 'Customs, or Usages of men do *know*, or *allow* 'of: They are One Mystical *Person*, whereof, 'although there may be some Imperfect Re-'semblances found in *Natural*, or *Political* '*Unions*, yet the Union from whence that 'Denomination is taken between *Him*, and '*Us*, is of that Nature, and arises from such '*Reasons*, and *Causes*, as no Personal Union 'among Men (or the *Union* of *many Persons*) 'hath any concernment in. Dr. O. of Justific. p. 250.

2. *Christ being our* Substitute, *or Delegate, Believed, and Repented for us, so as to exempt us from the necessity of doing it.*	2. *Christ did not Repent for us; nor exempt us from the necessity of doing it our selves.*

'Tis true, that Christ, our Surety, who Satisfied, and Merited, to exempt us from the necessity of doing either our selves, did undertake to enable the Elect to *Believe*, *Repent*, and *Personally* Obey the Holy Commandments; but never undertook to exempt them from the necessity of Believing, and Repenting.

Assertion II.

That the Guilt, as well as Punishment of Sin was laid on Christ.

We have made it clearly to appear, that though the *Guilt*, and *Punishment* of Sin was laid on Christ; yet the *Sin* it self, in its *formal* Nature, the *Macula*, or *Filth* of Sin, was not. *Guilt* (as I have shown) is a *Relation*, which hath a *Formal Sin* for its *Foundation*. The *Foundation* of *Guilt* is *Sin*, *formally* considered, the ἀνομία, the *Macula*, the *Filth*; and *Guilt*, the *Reatus Culpæ*, doth *immediately Result* from the Sin, that is a transgression of the Præcept. It is not then the *Sin* it self, the ἀνομία, the *Macula*, the *Filth*, that was laid on Christ, but the *Guilt* which resulted from it; the *Macula*, the *Filth* remained in us; the *Guilt*, that immediately resulted from it as it respected the Sanction of the Law, was laid on Christ, but this being somewhat distinct from the *Moral Filth*, Christ remained *Pure*, and *Spotless*, notwithstanding 'twas transferr'd over to *him*.

The Opposition.

Antinomian.	Truth.
3. *Sin*, and *Guilt* are *the same.*	3. *Sin, and Guilt, are* Not *the same.*
4. *Not only the* Punishment, *and* Guilt, but *the* Sin it self, *the* Filth *of Sin was laid on Christ.*	4. *The* Punishment, *and* Guilt *of Sin was laid on Christ; but not the* Sin it self, *its* Macula, *or* Filth.

In

In this particular the Difference is manifeſt. And it's plain, that tho' the *Antinomian* blaſpheme the Son of God by making him *Inherently* a Sinner; yet they who are againſt the transferring the Filth of Sin on Chriſt, are far from it; for, whilſt They are oppoſing the *Papiſt*, and *Socinian*, they do moſt effectually Fence againſt *Antinomianiſm*.

Aſſertion III.

That the Covenant of Grace is not Conditional, *in that ſenſe the* Papiſts *hold it to be ſo.*

The ſenſe in which the *Papiſts* are for the *Conditionality* of Faith and Good Works, hath been already ſtated; and the *Difference* between the Firſt Reformers, and *Modern Proteſtant Divines*, cleared. All *Popiſh Conditions*, that is to ſay, All Such *Conditions in us*, as give Right to the Reward, are excluded from having any Intereſt in our Juſtification: And yet Faith is made ſo neceſſary to our Juſtification, that without it we cannot be Juſtified; that our Juſtification is ſuſpended during its abſence, and that *Faith is an Inſtrumental Cauſe of Juſtification.* That the Promiſe of Pardon and Eternal Life is not made to *Sinners*, as *Sinners*; but it is made to them that have Faith, and are in *Covenant* with *God*; and only unto *ſuch.*

The

The Opposition.

Antinomian.	Truth.
5. *That the* Covenant *of* Grace *is without* All Conditions, *in every sense.*	5. *The Covenant of Grace is* not *without* Conditions, *in every sense; for,* Faith *is the* Condition *of Pardon.*
6. *That the Promise of Pardon is to* Sinners, *as* Sinners.	6. *The Promise of Pardon is not to* Sinners, *as* Sinners; *it is only to them that have* Faith, *and are in Covenant.*

Thus, whilst the *Popish* Doctrine of *Merit* is opposed, there is wrested out of the hands of *Arminians*, and *Socinians*, that, by which they endeavour to destroy *Particular Election*, *Christ's meriting*, *and the Spirit's giving the first Grace*, together with the glorious Doctrine of *Christ's Satisfaction*, and a sufficient Provision is laid in against the *Antinomian* Doctrine of *Universal Redemption.*

Assertion IV.

That Faith is a Certain, and Full Perswasion, *wrought in the heart of Man through the Holy Ghost, whereby he is* Assured *of* the Mercy of God, *promised in Christ, that* his Sins are forgiven him.

By such as have not throughly enough search'd into this Controversie, the *First Reformers,*

mers, for holding this *Assertion*, have been charg'd with *Antinomianism*: But, we have shown, 'twas unjustly. For, tho' of late years, our Divines, who have indeed rather *describ'd*, than *defin'd* Faith, and so, for the help of Doubting Souls, have put them on Enquiries after the *constant Concomitants*, and *inseparable Effects* of Saving Faith, to the end they might be help'd to well-grounded Evidences of their Interest in Christ; yet the *First Reformers* in the ensuing Instances about Saving Faith differ'd very much from the *Antinomians*.

Opposition.

Antinomians.	First Reformers.
7. *Faith lieth in a confident Perswasion, that my Sins were forgiven before I did believe.*	7. *Faith, tho' it lies in a Perswasion of the Forgiveness of Sins;* yet not that Sin was Pardoned *before Faith, but in the Instant of Believing.*
8. *This Faith admits of no Doubtings.*	8. *Faith admits of Fears and Doubtings.*
9. *A Person may have this Faith, and apply the Promise of Pardon, as well whilst under the Power of Sin, as after.*	9. *No Man whilst under the Power of Sin, can apply the Promise of Pardon, as well as after.*

Assertion V.

That Justifying Faith is not an Act of the Will, *but of the* Understanding *only.*

That Faith is only an Act of the Understanding, hath not been embraced by *Protestants* universally; the chief Defenders of it being *Camero*, *Amyrald*, and *Dally*. However, to do the *New Methodists* Justice, & that I might set forth this Controversie in its proper Light, and shew how they hereby secure themselves from the *Popish*, *Arminian*, and *Socinian* Notions about *Justification*, and how far they are from the Unjust Charge of *Antinomianism*, I have added the foregoing Chapter.

The Opposition.

Antinomians.	The New Methodists.
10. *True Faith may be, where no change of the* Will *is.*	10. *Tho' Faith be not an Act of the* Will; *yet is it not where the* Will *remains unchanged.*

Here then we may see not only the *Difference* there is between the above-mentioned *Assertions*, and *Antinomianism*; but have set before us such a Scheme of the *Antinomian Errors*, as makes the *Law* of *no use at all.*

But let us consider what manner of Persons would be brought within the *Antinomian Verge*, if

if these *Assertions* were *Antinomian*. Really the *Reverend Assembly* of Divines at *Westminster*, and all that drew up the *Savoy* Confession, with the whole Body of *United Ministers*, must come in for Receiving the *First Assertion*; the *Lutherans*, and *Calvinists* for holding the *Second*; the *First Reformers* generally, and many Learned Protestant Divines at this time, particularly Dr. *Witsius*, *Divinity Professor* at *Utricht*, (who, with the greatest Respect is earnestly desired to communicate his Thoughts freely on this occasion) for Defending the *Third*; All the *First Reformers* for the *Fourth*; and the *New-Methodists* for Propugning the *Fifth*; and none but the *Papist*, *Arminian*, and *Socinian* would be able to escape the Slander. And yet according to the best of my Judgment, the chief reason, why some worthy Brethren, have been Reflected on as *Antinomians*, hath been their Zeal for the first Four Assertions. For they do not make Christ our *Delegate*, or *Substitute*, who Believed and Repented for us, to the end he might exempt us from the necessity of doing either our selves. Nor do they make the Filth and Guilt of Sin the same, and lay them on Christ, making him thereby Filthy. Nor do they say, that the Covenant of Grace is in every respect without *Conditions*; or that the Promise of Pardon is to *Sinners*, as *Sinners*; or, that Faith lieth in a Perswasion, that Sin was Pardoned before we Believe; or, that Faith is Exclusive of the Least Fears, or Doubtings; or, that an Elect Person can apply the Promise of Pardon to it self as well before Regeneration,

as

as after; nor do they make the Law uſeleſs, but do hold, 'That in reference unto the 'work of Regeneration it ſelf, *poſitively* con- 'ſidered, we may obſerve, that ordinarily 'there are certain *Prævious*, and 'Præparatory works, or workings 'in and upon the Souls of Men, 'that are *Antecedent*, and Diſ- 'poſitive unto it: But, yet Re- 'generation doth not conſiſt in 'them, nor can it be educed out 'of them. This is for the *Sub- 'ſtance* of it, the *Poſition* of the 'Divines of the Church of *Eng- 'land*, at the *Synod* of *Dort*——

Sunt quædam effecta interna ad Converſionem PRÆVIA, *quæ virtute verbi, ſpirituſq; in nondum Regeneratorum cordibus excitantur, qualia ſunt* NOTITIA VOLUNTATIS DIVINÆ, SENSUS PECCATI, TIMOR POENÆ; COGITATIO *de* LIBERATIONE *ſpes aliqua veniæ.* Synod. Dord. Suffrag. Theol. Brit. and Art. 4. Theſ. 2.

'I ſpeak in this Poſition of them only that are Adult——'And the Diſpoſitions 'I intend, are only *materially* ſo; not ſuch as 'contain Grace of the *ſame Nature* as is Rege- 'neration it ſelf. A Material Diſpoſition is 'that, which *Diſpoſeth*, and ſome way maketh 'a ſubject fit for the Reception of that, which 'ſhall be communicated, added, or infuſed in- 'to it as its *Form*. So *Wood* by dryneſs, and a 'due compoſure is made fit and ready to admit 'of *Firing*. A Formal Diſpoſition is where 'one degree of the ſame kind diſpoſeth 'the ſubject unto further degrees of it. The 'former we allow, not the latter. So far Dr. *Owen* in his *Diſcourſe* concerning the Holy Spirit. And for thus much are the Accuſed Brethren, and on no more do the other Brethren, who have been charged with favouring *Arminianiſm* inſiſt; ſo that in all theſe things, ſo far as I underſtand them, they mean the ſame

Lib. 3. *c.* 3. *p.* 191, 192.

ſame thing, and are in the *Subſtance Agreed.*

My next work is to enter on the conſideration of the *Arminian*, and *Socinian* Notions: But this *Part* having ſwoln ſo big, and to give a juſt account of theſe Errors, and ſhew what is not *Arminianiſm*, nor *Socinianiſm*, will make the Diſcourſe too large. I am content, that this Part go forth by *it ſelf*, which ſhall be followed with the other, as ſoon as God gives opportunity to finiſh it.

FINIS.

---

same thing, and are in the *Substance Agreed.*

My next work is to enter on the consideration of the *Arminian*, and *Socinian* Notions: But this *Part* having Cyclon so big, and to give a just account of these Errors, and thaw what is not *Arminianism*, nor *Socinianism*, will make the Discourse too large. I am content, that this Part go forth by a *Self*, which shall be followed with the other, as soon as God gives opportunity to finish it.

FINIS.